

Certamen Religiosum :

O R,
A CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

The late King of ENGLAND, and the
late Lord Marquesse of *Worcester*,
concerning RELIGION.

TOGETHER WITH

A VINDICATION

OF THE

PROTESTANT CAUSE,

From the Pretences of the Marquesse
his Last Papers; which the necessity of the
KING'S Affaires denyed him
Opportunity to Answer.



L O N D O N,

Printed for *W. Lee*, at the Turks Head in *Fleet-street*,
and *R. Royson* at the Angel in *Ivis-lane*.

1651.

O R
A CONFERENCE

AT THE

late Lord Mansfield of Worcester,

TOGETHER WITH



PROTESTANT CAUSE

his last papers; which the necessity of the
Kings of Ardenne denied him

and R. K. as the Angel in the line.



TO THE READER.

COURTEOUS READER,



Doe not desire by way of Preface to trouble Thee with many words, but something I must crave leave to say, that thou mayest the better understand the reason and nature of this ensuing worke. It may be thou art not unacquainted with a Booke, which now hath bene extant some * years. The title of it is Certamen Religiosum, and it containeth in it a Conference, which was held partly by word of mouth, but chiefly by Writing, betwixt the late King and the Marquesse of Worcester, a stiffe defender of the Romish Religion. To the Marquesses first Plea (I speake of that, which passed betwixt them in writing) the King returned Answer, but the Marquesse replying, the Kings occasions (it seemes) would not permit him to rejoyne, especially the Reply being so large, and so thick lin'd with quotations, that the perusal and examination of it would require no little time. I know there are * some, who account this Conference no better then supposititious, which reflecting upon the Publisher of it, Doctor Bailly, he hath lately in a Preface to a † Booke, which hee hath set forth of his own, vindicated himself, and asserted the Conference. For my part, I know no cause to question the truth of the Relation, neither, as to my purpose, is it much materiall, whether

* It was published Anno 1649.

* See the Advertisement to the Reader prefixed to the late Kings workes set forth together in one volume.

† It is intituled (as I remember) *Herba Parietis*, or *The Wall-flower*.

To the Reader.

~~there were any such Conference, or if there were, whether~~
~~it were so managed, as is related.~~ This I see, that in the
Booke before mentioned (to wit, Certamen Religiosum)
the Romish cause is set out in great pompe, both Scriptures
and Fathers being produced as asserting most of those opi-
nions, which they of the Church of Rome maintaine, and
we impugne, and the Reader is left naked, and misfurnished
with any Armes and Weapons, wherewith either to defend
himselfe, or to offend his adversary save onely as he shall be
able to provide for himselfe, and bring with him. The first
time that I heard the Booke mentioned, (which was about
the last Spring) it was spoken of as a Booke of no little dan-
ger, and so I understood since diverse judge of it. Yea, I
have heard that some have said, that the Marquesse in this
Reply hath done more for the Church of Rome, then any
have done before him. When I got the Booke, and looked a
while into it, though I saw no reason to conceive so highly
of it, as (it seemes) some have done, yet I found in it (I con-
fesse) much more then I expected, so much as that I thought
it oportet premium no mis-pent time to answer it. This I
have indeavoured; how I have performed it, is left to Thee
(Reader, to judge. The great difficulty in the undertaking
did arise from the multitude of Authors that are alleged
(whether the Marques himselfe did peruse these authors, or
spoke them upon trust from others, I will not inquire, much
lesse determine), especially considering how lax and loose the
quotations are, the words of the Authors being scarce once
in a hundred times cited, and sometimes onely the Authour
named, many times onely the Book, but no Chapter or Section
mentioned. In this respect it could not be expected, that
every allegation should receive a punctuall answer, besides
that as in the Rejoynder is selfe upon occasion I acknow-
ledge) sometimes for want of the Authour I had not liberty

To the Reader.

to examine what is alleged; but this I presume will not be found so frequent, nor yet at all prejudiciall to the maine, so much still being said as may suffice to take off the force of that which is objected. There is an answer already come forth to the Marquesses last Paper, with which I have to deale. The * author of it is a gentleman of much reading, well versed in Greek and Latin writers, both Ecclesiasticall and others, as appears by this work, which is all that I have seene of his, though I hear of something else that he hath published not without great commendation. I had undertaken this task before I had any intimation that another was about it: and I think this of mine was at the Presse before the foresaid Answer came from it. I could not confine my selfe to such narrow bounds as that Gentleman hath done in answer to the Marquesse, (for he hath others also besides him to deal with) the reason of his conciseness is best knowne unto himselfe. I have launched further into the deepe, and have expatiated more in the discussion of those points, which are handled by the Marquesse; yet so, as that the Reader (I hope) will have no cause to complaine of prolixity, or to thinke me tedious. I have divided the worke into two parts; in the former part I have indoeavoured to shew the ungroundednes of the Romish doctrine in those points, which the Marquesse propoundeth, and the repugnancy of it both to Scriptures and Fathers, notwithstanding any thing he hath alleged in defence of it. In the latter part I have laboured to wipe off those aspersions, which the Marquesse doth cast upon diverse of our most eminent Divines, and chiefe instruments in the worke of Reformation, as Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Melancthon and Beza, partly in respect of their Doctrine, and partly in respect of their conversation. This the learned answerer before mentioned hath not attempted; but I did not think it meete to wave it, calumnies and reproches being more apt to prevaile

* Hamon
L'Estrange
Esquire.

To the Reader. ¶

with some other, any other argument whatsoever. Some points of controverſie alſo, which the Marqueſſe taketh occaſion to bring in, having not mentioned them before, are inſiſted on in this ſecond Part. Some perhaps may ſay, Quorū perditio hæc: What needed all this? theſe controverſies having bin ſufficiently handled by our writers, both at home and abroad, long agoe. I anſwer, 'Tis true, they have bin ſo: yet if the Marqueſſe thought it not enough that Bellarmine and many others of the Romiſh party have written largely in that behalfe, but judged it meet to produce his own Plea, I think there is as much reaſon why we ſhould conſider what he ſaith, and that ſome anſwer ſhould be given him, that ſo none may boaſt, as ſome are apt to doe in ſuch a caſe, that becauſe hee is unanſwered, therefore hee is unanſwerable. And beſides, though (Nil dictum, quod non dictum prius) the matter be not new, yet there may be (νεωτερίαι) a handling of the ſame things in another manner: yea, and diſverſe treating of the ſame ſubject, ſomething may be found in one, which is not in another. But (may ſome ſay) there are many other great and groſſe errors of late ſprung up among us, and theſe doe rather call for our care and diligence to ſuppreſſe them. For anſwer unto this, I grant that the prevailing errors of the times are mainly to be oppoſed; yet (as our Saviour ſaid in another caſe) this ought to be done, and the other not to be left undone. Yea, Popery is the grand evil that doth infect the Church; and by how much it is the more inveterate, & the more diffuſed, by ſo much the danger of it is the greater, and it requires the more oppoſition. There is alſo a ſpecial warning to come out of Babylon, Revel. 18. 4. and certainly it will avail us little to come out, except we alſo keepe out of it. And if we would keepe our ſelves out of Babylon, we muſt keepe the Babylonish Doctrines from finding entertainment with us. This will aſke no little care, no humane poli-

To the Reader.

oy in the world (I think) being greater then that which is used either for the supporting of that doctrine where it is, or the introducing of it where it is not embraced. Shall we thinke that the Romanists are idle in these busy times? Though few doe shew themselves, as the Marquesse did, (*youm nequm*) with open face; yet we may well suspect that many are working so, as that by how much they are the lesse conspicuous, by so much they are the more dangerous. And as David in a certaine case said to the woman of Tekoah, Is not the hand of Foab with thee in all this? So in respect of that heape of heterodox opinions that is among us, may it not be said, Is not the hand of a Iesuite in all this? Diverse Pamphlets in these times have admonished us to beware, and among the rest one intituled *Mutatus Polemo* (what ever the Authors designe were) doth speake not a little to this purpose. Before these troublesome times began, some have either expressed (as Mr. Archer) or intimated (as Mr. Mede) that (in their opinion) Popery shall yet againe for a while universally prevaile in those Countries and Nations, out of which it hath bin expelled. If this be so (as for any thing I see, I may hope the contrary) may it not be feared, that, as those many Antichrists (as they are called 1 Joh. 2. 18.) that is, those many heretikes, that were in the primitive times, did make way for the rise of that great Antichrist; so these in our times may make way for the restauration of him? And whereas we have heard long since of Romes Master-peece, I see not how any Romish designe can better deserve this title, then so to debase the Ministry, and to decry learning, as the practice of many is in these times. Hoc Ithacus velit, hoc magno mercentur Atreidæ, The Chieftaines of the Church of Rome can desire nothing more, then that among their adversaries the Ministry should be cast down, and learning overtrown. For then why should they doubt but that they may soon reduce

all

Arch. of Christe
personall raiga
on Earth, Page
50. and 55.
Mede on Revel.
21.7.

To the Reader.

all unto them, none being now of any competent ability to oppose them? It is observed by those that

Qui in historiarum Ecclesiasticarum lectione versati sunt, Christiani populi ignorantiam, & Romane sedis auctoritatem simul auctam facile animadvertere potuerunt. — Vicissimque ut bonarum literarum instauratione facessere cepit ignorantia, ita & Pontificis auctoritas paulatim in niqui & labascere visa est. Gentillet, Exam. Gentil. Trident. lib. 1. sect. 7. & vide plura.

are acquainted with Ecclesiasticall History, that when Learning was the lowest, then Popery got to be highest, as the one decayed, so the other was advanced: and on the other side, that the restoration of good literature did make way for the Reformation of Religion. Surely, if Popery

overspread againe, barbarisme and illiteratenesse is a most likely means to effect it. Neither are the Papists (I suppose) lesse politick, and wise in their generation then Julian the Apostate was, who could see no fairer way, whereby to re-establish Gentilisme, then by indeavouring to debase Christians of Learning, a thing so vile and odiens, that Ammianus Marcellinus himselfe, though a Pagan, and a great admirer of Julian, was ashamed of it, and shewed great dislike of Julian for it, calling it a cruell part, and a thing to be buried in

Illud autem inclementi obviandum pessimi silentio, quod auctor doctri Magistro Rhetoricos & Grammaticos rudes Christiani cultores. Am. Marcell. de Julia. lib. 22.

perpetuall silence. But I have held Thee (Reader) longer then I did intend; I will preface no further, but praying unto the Lord to preserve his Church from errors without, and to purge it from errors within, I rest

Thy Friend and lover in the truth.

C C.

The CONTENTS of the FIRST PART
OF THE
REIOYNDER.

- 1 **O**F the marks of the true Church, which they of the Church of Rome assigne, as Universality, Antiquity, Visibilty, Succession of Pastors, unity in Doctrine, and the Coverston of Nations, Page 107, to 114
- 2 Of having recourse unto the Scriptures in matters that concern Religion, 114, 115, 116
- 3 Of relying either on Fathers singly and severally considered, or on a generall Councel, 116, 117, 118, 119
- 4 That the Apostles, as Pen-men of the Holy Ghost, could not erre, 120
- 5 Of the easines and plainnes of the Scriptures, 120, 121
- 6 Of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, 122, to 140
- 7 Whether the Church hath any infallible rule besides the Scripture for the understanding of Scripture, 140, to 147
- 8 Again of the Scriptures being easie to be understood, 147, 148
- 9 Whether the Church can erre, or not, 148, to 152
- 10 Again of the Visibilty of the Church, 152, 153
- 11 Of the Universality of the Church, 153, to 158
- 12 Of the unity of the Church in matters of faith, 158, 159
- 13 Of Kings and Queens being Heads on Governours
(a) and

The Contents.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <i>and Governesses of the Church within their Domi- nions,</i> | 159, 160 |
| 14 <i>Of the Ministers power to forgive sins,</i> | 159 (as tis misprinted) to 162 |
| 15 <i>Of confessing sins to a ghostly Father,</i> | 162, to 172 |
| 16 <i>Of works of Superogation,</i> | 172, to 176 |
| 17 <i>Of Free-will,</i> | 176, to 195 |
| 18 <i>Of the possibility of keeping the Commande- ments,</i> | 196, to 201 |
| 19 <i>Of justification by faith alone,</i> | 201, to 211 |
| 20 <i>Of Merits,</i> | 211 to 216 |
| 21 <i>Whether justifying faith may be lost,</i> | 216 to 221 |
| 22 <i>Of Reprobation,</i> | 221 to 239 |
| 23 <i>Of assurance of Salvation,</i> | 239 to 251 |
| 24 <i>Whether every Believer hath a peculiar Angel to be his guardian,</i> | 251 to 254 |
| 25 <i>Of the Angels praying for us, and knowing our thoughts,</i> | 254, 255, 256 |
| 26 <i>Of praying to the Angels,</i> | 256 to 261 |
| 27 <i>Whether the Saints deceased know our affairs here below,</i> | 261, to 266 |
| 28 <i>Of the Saints deceased praying for us,</i> | 266, to 269 |
| 29 <i>Of praying to the Saints deceased,</i> | 269, to 276 |
| 30 <i>Of Confirmation, whether it be a Sacrament properly so called,</i> | 276, to 281 |
| 31 <i>Of communicating in one kinde,</i> | 281, to 287 |
| 32 <i>Of the sacrifice of the Masse, as they call it: or whe- ther Christ be truly and properly offered up and sacri- ficed in the Eucharist, or Lords Supper,</i> | 287, to 296 |
| 33 <i>Whether Orders (or rather Ordination) be a Sacra- ment of like nature with Baptisme and the Lord Sup- per,</i> | 296, to 301 |
| 34 <i>Of</i> | |

The Contents.

| | | |
|----|--|---------------|
| 34 | Of Vows of chastity, and of the Marriage of Ecclesiastical persons, | 301, to 318 |
| 35 | Of Christs descending into Hell, | 319, to 340 |
| 36 | Of Purgatory, | 340, to 355 |
| 37 | Of extreme Unction, | 355, to 363 |
| 38 | Of the saying of Austine, Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesie Authoritas commoveret, I should not believe (or should not have believed, crederem for credidissem) the Gospel, except the authority of the Church did move (or had moved, comoveret for commovisset) me to it. | 364, 365, &c. |

The Contents of the Second Part of the Rejoynder.

| | | |
|----|---|------------|
| 1 | OF the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, | Page 1, 2 |
| 2 | Of Luthers Doctrine, | 3, to 20 |
| 3 | Zuinglius vindicated from that which by the way is charged upon him, | 19 |
| 4 | Of Calvines Doctrine, | 20, to 35 |
| 5 | Of Zuinglius his Doctrine, | 35, to 40 |
| 6 | Of Melancthons Doctrine, 40, 41, 42. | (addition. |
| 7 | Of Andreas Musculus his Doctrine, 42. and in the | |
| 8 | Of the divisions that are among Protestants, | 42 |
| 9 | Of that Unity which is among them of the Church of Rome, | 42, to 46 |
| 10 | Of Crimes charged upon Protestants, and the testimonies alledged for proof of them, | 46 |
| 11 | Of Luthers conference with the Devil, | 46, 47, 48 |
| 12 | Whether Zuinglius were an Author of war, and a disturber of peace, &c. | 48, 49 |
| 13 | Beza cleared of a foul aspersion cast upon him, | 49, 50 |
| 14 | Of Luthers writing against King Henry 8. | 50, 51 |
| | | 15 Of |

The Contents.

- 15 Of the people of the reformed Churches, whether they
be so vitious and corrupt, as they are censured, 51, 52
- 16 A vindication of Calvin in respect of vild aspersions
cast upon him, 53, 54
- 17 Mantuans testimony concerning Rome, and the
corrupt estate of it, 54, 55
- 18 Whether the Doctrine of the Church of Rome be the
the same still that it was at first, 55
- 19 Of Prayers for the Dead, 55, 56, 57
- 20 Of Lent-Fast, 57, 58
- 21 Of mingling Water with Wine in the Lords Supper,
58, 59, 60
- 22 Of diverse ceremonies, which the Church of Rome
useth in Baptisme, 60, 61
- 23 Of the necessity of Infants Baptisme, and whether
they may be saved without it, 61, 62, 63
- 24 Of the several Ecclesiastical Orders which they
have in the Church of Rome, 63, 64, 65
- 25 Of the Pope and his Supremacy, 65, 66, 67
- 26 Of service in an unknown tongue, 67, 68, 69
- 27 Of Festivals, 69, 70
- 28 Of Reliques, 70, 71
- 29 Of Pictures and Images, 71, to 77
- 30 Of the signe of the Crosse, 77
- 31 Of Luther, Husse, and Wickliffe holding some er-
rours, and so others that oppose the Church of
Rome, 78
- 32 That some before Berengarius, as namely Bertram,
did professedly impugn that reall presence of Chrise
in the Sacrament, which they of the Church of Rome
maintain, 79, 80

Certamen



CERTAMEN RELIGIOSUM:
OR,
A CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

The late King of *England*, and the late
Lord Marquesse of *Worcester*, con-
cerning Religion, at His Majesties being
at *Ragland-Castle*, 1646.

Marquesse.



*If, I hope if they catch us in the act, it will
not be deemed in me an act of so high con-
spiracy, in regard that I enter the lists, lea-
ning upon a Doctor of your own Church.*

*To whom the King replied as merrily,
My Lord, I know not whether I should
have a better opinion of your Lordship for the Doctors
sake, or a worse opinion of the Doctor for your Lord-
ships sake; for though you leane much upon his arme,
yet he may lean more upon your judgment.*

B

Marq.

Marq. Sir, it conduceth a little to the purpose we have in hand, to be a little serious in the thing you speak of: your Majesty knows the grounds of my acquaintance with the Doctor, and my obligation to him, which difference in opinion shall never mitigate in point of affection; but I protest unto you, I could never gain the least ground of him yet, in perswading him from his principles.

King. It may be your Lordship hopes to meet with a weaker Disputant of me.

Marq. Not so, and if it please your Majesty, but I think thus: That if it should please God to make me so happy an instrument of his Churches good, as to be a means to incline your royall heart to imbrace the truth, I beleewe that he, and thousands such as he, would be soon brought to follow your Majesty in the right way, who are so constant followers of your steps whilst you are in a wrong path: the Oaths which they have taken, the relation which their Hierarchy have to the Crown, which must be no longer so, but whilst the government of the Church and soules, stand as a reserve to the regiment of lives and fortunes, the preferment which they expect from your Majesty, and the enjoyment of those preferments which they have already, which they must no longer enjoy, then whilst they are, or seem to be of your opinion, causeth them to smother their own knowledge, whilst their mouths are stopt with interest; whereas if the strong Tide of your Majesties opinion were but once turn'd, all the ships in the river would soon turn head. " Hercupon the " Marquesse fell abruptly from his subject, and asked " the King, Sir, I pray tell me what is it that you want? The " King smiled a little at his sudden breaking off, and " making such preposterous haste to aske that question, " answered,

King. My Lord, I want an Army, can you help me to one?

Marq.

Marq. Yes, that I can ; and to such a one, as should your Majesty commit your self to their fidelity, you should be a Conquerour, fight as often as you please.

King. My Lord, such an Army would do the businesse : I pray let me have it.

Marq. What if your Majesty would not confide in it, when it should be presented unto you ?

King. My Lord, I would fain see it, and as fain confide in that, of which I had reason to be confident.

Marq. Take Gedeons three hundred men, and let the rest be gone.

King. Your Lordship speaks mystically, will it please you to be plain a little ?

Marq. Come, I see I must come nearer to you : Sir, it is thus : God expected a work to be done by your hands, but you have not answered his expectation, nor his mercy towards you : when your enemies had more Cities and Garrisons, then you had private families to take your part ; when they had more Cannons then you had Muskets ; when the people crowded to heap treasures against you, whilst your Majesties friends were fain here and there to make a gathering for you ; when they had Navies at Sea, whilst your Majesty had not so much as a Boat upon the River ; whilst the oddes in number against you was like a full crop against a gleaning ; then God wrought his miracle, in making your gleaning bigger then their vintage ; he put the power into your hand, and made you able to declare your self a true man to God, and gratefull to your friends : but like the man whom the Prophet makes mention of, who bestowed great cost and paines upon his vineyard, and at last it brought forth nothing but wilde grapes ; so when God had done all these things for You, and expected that You should have given his Church some respite to their oppressions, I heard say, You made vows

* Naseby
Fight.

that if God blest You but * that day with Victory, You would not leave a Catholike in Your Army; for which I feare the Lord is so angry with You, that (I am afraid) he will not give you another day wherein you may so much as trie your fortune: Your Majesty had forgot the monies which came unto you from unknown hands, and were brought unto you by unknown faces, when you promised you would never forsake your unknown friends; you have forgotten the miraculous blessings of the Almighty upon those beginnings, and how have you discountenanced, distrusted, disregarded, I, and disgraced the Catholiques all along, and at last vowed an extirpation of them: Doth not your Majesty see clearly, how that in the two great Battailles, the North and Naseby, God shewed signes of his displeasure, when in the first your Enemies were even at your mercy, confusion fell upon you, and you lost the day, like a man that should so wound his Enemies, that he could scarce stand, and afterwards his owne sword should fly out of the hilt, and leave the strong and skilfull to the mercy of his falling Enemies; and in the second (and I feare me the last Battaille that e're you'll fight) whilst your men were crying victory, as I hear they had reason so to do, your sword broke in the aire, which made you a fugitive to your flying Enemies: Sir, I pray pardon my boldnesse, for it is Gods cause that makes me so bold, and no inclination of my owne to be so, and give me leave to tell you, that God is angry with you, and will never be pleased untill you have taken new resolutions concerning your Religion: which I pray God direct you, or else you'll fall from nought to worse, from thence to nothing.

King. My Lord, I cannot so much blame as pity your zeal; the soundnesse of Religion is not to be tried by dint of sword, nor must we judge of her truthes by the prosperity of events, for then of all men Christians would

would be most miserable; we are not to be thought no followers of Christ, by observations drawne from what is crosse or otherwise, but by taking up our crosse and following Christ. Neither do I remember my Lord, that I made any such vow before the Battaille of *Naseby* concerning Catholiques, but some satisfaction I did give my Protestant Subjects, who on the other side were perswaded that God blest us the worse for having so many Papists in our Army.

Marq. The difference is not great, I pray God forgive you, who have most reason to aske it.

King. I think not so my Lord.

Marq. Who shall be judge?

King. I pray my Lord, let us sit down, and let reason take her seat.

Marq. Reason is no judge.

King. But she may take her place.

Marq. Not above our Faith.

King. But in our arguments.

Marq. I beseech your Majesty to give me a reason why you are so much offended with our Church?

King. Truly my Lord, I am much offended with your Church, if you meane the Church of *Rome*, if it were for no other reason, but this, for that she hath foisted into her legend, so many ridiculous stories, as are able to make (as much as in them lies) Christianity it selfe a fable, whereas if they had not done this wrong, unto the tradition of the primitive Church, we then had left unto us such rare and unquestionable verities, as would have adorned, and not dawb'd the Gospel, whereas now we know not, what is true, or false.

Marq. Sir, if it be allowed to question, what the Catholick Church holds out for truth, because that which they

hold

hold forth unto us seemes ridiculous, and to picke and chuse verities according to our owne fancie, and reject as novelties and forgeries what we please, as impossibilités and fabulous; the Scriptures themselves may as well suffer by this kind of tolleration: for what more ridiculous then the Dialogue betweene Balaam and his Ass, or that Sampsons strength should be in his hair, or that he should slay a thousand men with the Jaw-bone of an Ass, the Disputation betweene Saint Michael and the Devill about the body of Moses, Philip's being taken up in the air, and found at Azotus, with a thousand the like strange, and to our apprehension (if we looke upon them with carnall eyes) vaine and ridiculous: but being they are recorded in Scripture, which Scripture we hold for truth, we admire, but never question them: so the fault may not be in the tradition of the Church, but in the libertie which men assume to themselves to question the tradition. And I beseech Your Majestie, to consider the streaks that are drawn over the Divine writ, as so many delenda's, by such bold hands as those: the Testaments were not like the two Tables, delivered into the hands of any Moses, by the immediate hand of God, neither by the Ministration of Angels, but men inspired with the holy Ghost writ, whose writings by the Church were approved to be by inspiration, which inspirations were called Scripture, which Scriptures, most of them, as they are now received into our hands, were not received into the Canon of the Church, all, within three hundred years after Christ; why may not some bold spirit call all those Scriptures (which were afterwards acknowledged to be Scripture, and were not before) forgeries. Nay have not some such (as blind as bold) done it already? Saint Hieron was the first that ever picked a hole in the Scriptures, and cut out so many books out of the word of God, with the penknife of Apocrypha; Rufinus chal-

lengeth

length him for so doing, and tells him of the gap, that he hath opened for wild beasts to enter into this field of the Church, and tread downe all ill corne. Jerom gives his reasons, because they were not found in the Originall Copie, (as if the same spirit which gave to those, whom it did inspire, the diversities of tongues, should it selfe be tied to one language) but withall he acknowledgeth thus much of those books, which he had thus markt in the forehead, Canonici sunt ad informandos mores, sed non ad confirmandam fidem: how poor a Distinction this is, and how pernicious a president this was, I leave it to Your Majestie to judge: for after him Luther takes the like boldness, and at once takes away the three Gospels, of Mark, Luke, and John; others take away the epistle to the Hebrews, others the epistle of Saint Jude, others the second and third epistles of Saint Peter, others the epistle of Saint James, others the whole book of the Revelation. Wherefore to permit what the Church proposes to be questionable by particular men, is to bring down the Church, the Scriptures, and the Heavens upon our heads. There was a Church, before there was a Scripture, which Scripture (as to us) had not beene the Word of God, if the Church had not made it so, by teaching us to believe it. The preaching of the Gospell was before the writing of the Gospell, the Divine Truth that dispersed it selfe over the face of the whole earth, before it's Divinitie was comprised within the Canon of the Scripture, was like that Primæva Lux, which the world received before the light was gathered into the body of the Sun: this body so glorious and comfortable is but the same light, which was before, we cannot make it another, though it be otherwise: And therefore though the Church and the Scripture, like the light that is concomitant and precedent to the Sun, be distinct in terms, yet they are but one and the same, no
man

man can see the Sun, but by it's own light; shut your eyes from this light, and you cannot behold the body of the Sun: Shut your eyes against one, and you are blind in both: he never had God to be his Father, who had not the Church to be his Mother. If you admit Sillogismes à priori, you will meet with many paralogismes à posteriori cry downe the Churches, Authoritie, and pull out the Scriptures efficacie, give but the Church the lie now and then, and you shall have enough will tell you the Scripture is false here and there; they who have set so little by the tradition of the Church, have set by halfe the Scriptures, and will at last throw all away: wherefore in a word, as to deny any part of the Scripture, were to open a vein, so to question any thing which the Church proposes, is to teare the scamelesse Coat of Christ, and to pierce his body.

King. My Lord, I see you are better provided with Arguments then I am with memorie, to run through the series of your Discourse; satisfie me but in one thing, and I shall soone yeild to all that you have said, and that is concerning this Catholick Church you talke of, I know the creed tells us, that we must believe it, and Christ tells us, that we must hear it, but neither tell us, that that is the Church of Rome.

Marq. Gratiouse Sir, the creed tells us, that it is the Catholick Church, and Saint Paul tells us in his epistle to the Romans; that their faith was spread abroad through the whole world.

King. That was the Faith, which the Romanes then believed, which is nothing to the Roman Faith which is now believed.

Marq. The Roman Faith then and now are the same.

King. I deny that my Lord.

Marq. When did they alter their Faith?

King.

King. That requires a librarie : Neither is it requisite, that I tell you the time when, if the envious man sowes his tares, whilst the husband-man was asleep, and afterwards he awakes and sees the tares, are they not tares, because the husband-man knowes not when they were sown ?

Marq. And if it please Your Majestie, in a thing that is so apparent, your similitude holds good, but the differences between us and the Protestants are not so without dispute, as that it is yet granted by the major part of Christians, that they are errors which we believe contrary to your Tenents, and therefore the similitude holds not, but I shall humbly intreat Your Majestie, to consider the proofs, which the learned Cardinal Peroone hath made concerning this particular, in his answer to your Royall Father his Apologie to all Christian Princes, where he proves, how that all the Tenents which are in controversie now between you and us, were practised in the Church of Christ, within the first three hundred years, wherefore I think, it would be no injury to reason to require belief, that that which hath been so long continued in the Church, and so universally received, and no time can be set down, when those Tenents or Ceremonies did arise, must needs be Catholick for time and place, and Apostolicall for institution, though we have no warrant from the Scriptures, to believe them to be such. For the Apostle Saint Paul commanded Timothy to keep fast the things which he had delivered unto him, as well by word as by writ. Wherefore if we will believe no tradition, we may come at last to believe no writings.

King. That was your owne fault, wherefore I blame your Church, for the way to make the Scriptures not believed, were to adde unto them new inventions, and say they were Scriptures.

Marq. If the Church of Christ had so mean esteeme then, as amongst some she hath now, certainly the former books received into her Canon, would have been much prejudiced by the admittance of the latter; wherefore if the Church be questionable, then all is brought in question.

King. My Lord, you have not satisfied me, where this Church is: and as concerning the Cardinals book, I have seen it, and have read a part of it, but doe not remember, neither doe I believe, that he hath prov'd that which you say.

Marq. It may be the proofes were in that part of the book, which Your Majesty did not read: and as for my proving the Roman Church to be this Church, by which we should be all guided, I thus shall doe my endeavour: That Church whose Doctrine is most Catholick and universall, must be the Catholick Church: but the Roman Church is such. Ergo.

King. My Lord, I deny your Minor, the Romane Church is not most universall; the Grecian Church is far more spreading; and if it were not, it were no Argument, for the Church of the Mahumetanes, is larger then both.

Marq. First, This is no Argument, either for an English Man, or a Protestant, but for a Grecian, or Mahumetane: not for an English Man, because he received his Conversion from Rome, and therefore he in Reason should not look beyond Rome, or the Doctrine that Rome practised then, when they converted England: nor for a Protestant, because he is as far distant from the Grecian Church in matter of opinion, as from the Romane; and therefore he need not look for that which he hath no desire to find: besides, the Greek Church hath long agoe submitted to the Church of Rome, and there is no reason, that others should make Arguments for her, who are not of her, when she stands

stands in no competition her selfe; besides, there is not in any place wherever the Greek Church is, or hath beene planted, where there are not Roman Catholicks; but there are diuerse Countreys in Christendome, where there is not one Professour of the Greek Church; neither is there a place in all the Turks Dominions, where there are not Romane Catholicks, nor in any part of the world, where there are not multitudes of Romanes; neither is there a Protestant Countrey in Christendome, where there are not Romane Catholicks numberlesse, but not a Protestant amongst the Natives, neither of Spaine or Italy. Shew me but one Protestant Countrey in the world, who ever deserted the Romane Faith, but they did it by Rebellion, except England, and there the King and the Bishops were the principall reformers: (I pray God, they doe not both suffer for it.) Shew me but one reformed Church, that is of the opinion of another: aske an English Protestant, where was your Religion before Luther: and he will tell you of Hus and Jerom of Prague: search for their Tenents, and you shall find them as far different from the English Protestant, as they are from one another; run to the Waldenses for your Religions antiquity, and you shall find as much difference in their Articles, and ours, as can be between Churches that are most opposite. Come home to your owne Countrey, and deriue your descent from Wickliffe, and search for his Tenents in the booke of Martyrs, and you shall find them quite contrary to ours, neither amongst any of your moderne Protestants shall you find any other agreement, but in this one thing, that they all protest against the Pope. Shew me but any Protestant Countrey in the world, where Reformation, as you call it, ever set her foot, where she was not as well attended with sacriledge, as usher'd by Rebellion, and I shall lay my hand upon my mouth for ever.

King. My Lord, my Lord, you are gone beyond the scope of your Argument, which required you to prove the *Romane* Church more Catholick then the Greek, which you have not done; you put me off with my being *English*, and not a *Grecian*, whereas when we speak of the universality of a Church, I think that any man who is belonging to the universe, is *objectum rationis*. And if that be the manner of your Election, then I am sure most voices must carry it: for your alleaged submission of the *Greek* Church unto the *Roman*, I believe it cannot be prov'd, but it may be the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, may submit unto the Pope of *Rome*, and yet the *Greek* Church may not submit unto the *Romane*.

Marq. Sir, it is no dishonour for the Sun to make its progress from East to West, it is still the same Sun, and the difference is onely in the shadowes, which are made to differ according to the varieties of shapes, that the severall substances are of; East and West are two divisions, but the same day: neither can they be said or imagined to be greater, or more extending one or other, and the one may have the benefit of the Suns light, though the other may have its glory; and I believe, no man of sober judgment can say, that any Church in the world is more generally spread over the face of the whole world, or that her glory shines in any place more conspicuously, then at this day in *Rome*.

King. My Lord, if externall glory be the Sun-shine of the Gospel, then the Church is there indeed; but if internall sanctity, and inward holynesse be the Essences of a Church, then we may be as much to seek for such a Church within the Walls of *Rome*, as any where else.

Marq. Who shall be Judge of that? I pray observe the Injustice and Errors that will arise, if every man may be
admitted

admitted to be his owne judge; you of the Church of England left your Mother the Church of Rome, and Mother to all the Churches round about; You forsook her, and set up a new Church of your own, Independent to her: there comes a new generation, and doth the like to you; and a third generation, that is likely to do the like to that; and the Church falls and falls, untill it falls to all the pieces of Independencie. It is a hard case for a part to fall away from the whole, and to be their owne judges. Why should not Kent fall away from England, and be their owne judges, as well as England fall away from Christendome, and be their own judges? why should not a Parish in Kent fall away from the whole County, and be their owne judges? why should not one Family fall away from the whole Parish, and be their owne judges? why should not one man fall away in his opinion from that Family, and be his owne judge? If you grant one, you must grant all; and I feare me, in doing one, you have done all. So that every man despiseth the Church, whilst he is a Church in himselfe; rayles against Popery, and is the greatest Pope himselfe, despiseth the Fathers, and will enthrone his own judgment above the wisdom of the ancient; refuseth Expositours, that he may have his own sence; and if he can start up but some new opinions, he thinks himselfe as worthy a member of Christianity, as if he were an Apostle to some new foundland. Now Sir, though some do take the Church to be the Scriptures, yet the Scriptures cannot be the Church, because the Scriptures send us to the Church, audi Ecclesiam, dic Ecclesie: others take the Elect to be the Church; yet this cannot be, for we know not who are elect, and who are not; that which must be the Church, must be a visible, an eminent societie of men, to whose Authority in cases of appeals and matter of judgment, we are to acquiesce and subscribe. And I appeale to

Your Royall heart, whether there be a Church in the world, whom in these respects we ought to reverence and esteeme more then the Church of Rome; and that the Church of Rome is externally glorious, it doth not follow, that therefore she is not internally holy; for the Kings daughters clothing was of wrought gold, as well as she was all glorious within; and though she had never so many Divine graces within her, yet she had honourable women without her, as her attendants: and for the question, whether this inward glory is to be so much sought for within the gates of Rome, is the question, and not yet decided.

King. My Lord, I'll deale as ingenuously with you as I can. When the *Romane* Monarch stretch'd forth his arms from *East* to *West*, he might make the Bishops of *Romes* oecumenacy as large as was his Empire, and all the Churches in the world were bound to follow her Lawes and decretalls, because God hath made such Emperours nursing Fathers of his Church, as it was prophesied by the Divine *Esay*; alwayes provided, that the child be not pourtraçured greater then the Nurse, (as hath been observed by the pride of your Bishops of *Rome*;) but when the severall Kingdoms of Christendome shook off the *Romane* Yoke; I see no reason why the Bishop of *Rome* should expect obedience from the Clergie of other Countries, any more then the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* should expect obedience from the Clergie of other Kingdoms. And for your deriving your Authority from Saint *Peter*; I know no reason, why we may not as well derive our Authority from *Simon Zelotes*, or *Ioseph of Arimathea*, or from *Philip*, of whose planting the Gospell we have as good warrant, as you have for Saint *Peter* his planting the Gospel in *Rome*. But, my Lord, I must tell you, that there are
other

other Objections to be made against your Church; which more condemns her, if these were answered.

Marq. *May it please Your Majestie, to give me leave to speak a word or two, to what I have said, and then I shall humbly beg Your further Objections. As to that of the Christian Kingdomes shaking off the Roman Yoke, and falling to pieces, which was so prophesied it should, yet the Church should not doe so, because it is said it shall remaine in unitie: and for Your Majesties objection concerning Simon Zelotes, Joseph of Arimathea, &c. It is answered, that there were two conversions, the first of the Brittaines, the second of the Saxons; we onely require this justice from you, as you are English, not Welch-men, for the Church of England, involves all the Brittaines within her Communion: for the Brittaines have not now any distinct Church from the Church of England. Now if Your Majestie please, I expect your further Objections.*

King. My Lord, I have not done with you yet: though particular Churches may fall away in their severall respects of obedience to one supreme Authority, yet it follows not, that the Church should be thereby divided, for as long as they agree in the unity of the same spirit, and the bond of peace, the Church is still at unitie, as so many sheaves of corne are not unbound, because they are severed. Many sheaves may belong to one field, to one man, and may be carryed to one barne, and be servient to the same table. Unity may consist in this, as well as in being hudled up together in a rick with one cock-sheave above the rest. I have an hundred pieces in my pocket, I find them something heavie, I divide the summe, halfe in one pocket, and halfe in another: and subdivide them afterwards in two severall lesser pockets; The moneys, is divided, but the summe is not broke,

broke, the hundred pounds is as whole as when it was together, because it belongs to the same man, and is in the same possession; so though we divide our selves from *Rome*, if neither of us divide our selves from Christ, we agree in him, who is the Center of all unitie, though we differ in matter of depending upon one another. But my Lord of *Worcester*, we are got into such a large field of discourse, that the greatest Schollers of them all can sooner shew us the way in, then out of it; therefore, before we goe too far, let us retire, lest we lose our selves; and therefore, I pray my Lord, satisfie me in these particulars: Why doe you leave out the second Commandment, and cut another in two? why doe you with-hold the Cup from the Laytie? why have you seven Sacraments, when Christ instituted but two? why doe you abuse the World with such a fable as Purgatory, and make ignorant fooles believe, you can fish soules from thence with silver hookes? why doe you pray to Saints, and worship Images? Those are the offences which are given by your Church of *Rome* unto the Church of Christ; of these things I would be satisfied.

Marq. Sir, although the Church be undefiled, yet she may not be spotlesse, to severall apprehensions: For the Church is compared to the Moon, that is full of spots; but they are but spots of our fancying; though the Church be never so comely, yet she is described unto us to have black eye-browes, which may to some be as great an occasion of dislike, as they are to others foyles, which set her off more lovely. We must not make our fancies, judgements of condemnation to her, with whom Christ so much was ravished. For Your Majesties Objections, and first, as to that of leaving out the second Commandment, and cutting another
in

in two; I beseech Your Majestie, who called them Commandments? who told you they were ten? who told you which were first, and second? &c. The Scripture onely called them words: those words, but these: and these words were never divided in the Scriptures into ten Commandments, but two Tables; the Church did all this, and might as well have named them twenty as ten Commandments; that which Your Majestie calls the second Commandment, is but the explanation of the first, and is not razed out of the Bible, but for brevities sake in the manuell it is left out, as the rest of the Commandment is left out concerning the Sabbath, and others: wherefore the same Church which gave them their Name, their Number, and their Distinction, may in their breviats, leave out what she deems to be but exposition; and deliver what she thinks for substance, without any such heaوية charge as being blottable out of the booke of life, for diminishing the word of God.

For withholding the Cup from the Laytie, where did Christ either give, or command to be given, either the Bread or the Wine to any such? Drink ye all of this: but they were all Apostles to whom he said so, there were neither Lay-men or women there: If the Church allowed them afterwards to receive it, either in one, or both kinds, they ought to be satisfied therewith accordingly, but not question the Churches Actions. She that could alter the Sabbath into the Lords day, and change the dipping of the Baptised over head and eares in water, to a little sprinkling upon the face, (by reason of some emergencies, and inconveniencies, occasioned by the difference of Seasons, and Countries) may, upon the like occasion, accordingly dispose of the manner of her Administration of her Sacraments. Neither was this done without great reason, the world had not wine

in all her Countries, but it had bread. Wherefore it was thought for uniformity sake (that they might not be unlike to one another, but all receive alike) that they should onely receive the Bread, which was to be had in every place, and not the Cup, in regard that Wine was not every where to be had. I wonder that any body should be so much offended at any such thing, for Bread and Wine doe signifie Christ crucified; I appeal to common reason, if a dead body doth not represent a passion as much as if we saw the blood lie by it. If you grant the Churches Power in other matters, and rest satisfied therein, why do you boggle at this, especially when any Priest, (where Wine is to be had) if you desire it, he will give it you? But if upon every mans call the Church should fall to reforming upon every seeming fault, which may be but supposed to be found, the people would never stop untill they had made such a through Reformation in all parts, as they have done in the greatest part of Germany, where there is not a man to Preach, or hear the Gospell, to eat the Bread, or drink the Wine: you never pick so many holes in our Coates, as this licentiousnesse hath done in yours.

For our seven Sacraments, she that called the Articles of our Faith 12, the Beatitudes 8, the Graces 3, the Virtues 4, called these 7, and might have called them 17 if she had thought it meet. A Sacrament is nothing else but what is done with a holy mind, and why Sacrament, either in Name, or Number, should be confin'd to Christs onely Institution, I see no cause for it; If I can prove that God did institute such a thing in Paradise, (as he did Marriage) shall not I call that a Sacrament as well as what was instituted by Christ, when he was upon the Earth? If Christ institutes the Order of giving, and receiving the holy Ghost, shall not I call this the Sacrament of Orders? If Christ in-
jaynes

joynes us all repentance, shall we not say repentance is a Sacrament? If Christ blessing little children, and saith, Suffer them to come unto me, and forbid them not; shall we not say that such confirmation is a Sacrament? Truly I doe not understand their meaning; They have taken away five, which five, either by God, or Christ, or the holy Ghost, (who are all one) were instituted; and yet they say they are not Sacraments, because they were not instituted by Christ: And the two that are left, viz. Baptisme, and the Lords Supper; for the first, you hold it necessary to Salvation; and for the second, you do not admit the reall presence: so that of the two remaining, you have taken away the necessity of the one, and the reality of the other, so farwell all.

Now for Purgatory, I do believe, we have as good ground for it out of this place of Scripture, viz. He shall be purged, yet so as if it were by fire: as you can prove a Hell out of this place of Scripture; He shall be cast into utter darknesse, and into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Neither can you make more exceptions to our inference out of this place of Scripture, to prove Purgatory, then the Atheist (if wits may be permitted to roame in such things, as these once settled, and believed generally) will find ground enough to quarrell at your burning lake; and the vaine Philosopher, Contradictions enough, in the description of the effects of those hellish Torments, viz. weeping and gnashing of teeth: the one having its procedure from heat, the other from cold, which are meer Contradictions, and therefore fabulous; take heed we doe not take away Hell, in removing of Purgatory. You see not, how your laughing at Purgatory hath caused such laughing at Hell, and Devils; untill at last, you shall see them bid the Heavens come down, and pluck the Almighty out of his Throne: If a Text of

Scripture with the Churches Exposition be not sufficient for a man to rest, both his Science and Conscience upon: I know not where it will find a resting place, it may shoot at Rاندome, but never take so right an ayme; and for the silver booke you talk'd of, I do not justifie the abuse of any, I know there is a great difference betweene the Court of Rome, and the Church of Rome; and if these Errours were in the Church it selfe, yet the tares must not be hastily pluckt out of the field of the Church, lest the wheat be pluckt up with it.

Now for our praying to Saints, there is no body that prayes to any Saints, otherwise then as we on earth desire the benefit of one anothers prayers. We do not believe that they can help us (of themselves) or that they have power to forgive sin, but we believe that they are nearer to God his favour, and more deare unto him: and therefore we believe, that he will heare them with, or for us, sooner then he will hear us when we pray upon our own account: as we desire the prayers of some good and holy man, (whom we believe to be so) hoping it will be a benefit unto us. All that can be said against it, is, that they do not hear us. I will not trouble Your Majestie with the Schoolmens Speculum Creatoris, but I shall desire to be plaine: When there is joy in heaven over every sinner that repenteth; do you think that the Saints which are there, are ignorant of the occasion of that joy? or do they rejoyce at they know not what? If the Saints in heaven do crie, How long Lord, how long, holy and just, dost thou not avenge our blood upon them, which dwell upon the earth: if they know that their blood is not yet avenged, do they not know when a sinner is converted? and if they know the time of conversion, do they not know, the time of prayer? If Abraham knew that there were such men as Moles and the Prophets, who was dead so many hundred

Hundreds of years before their time, can we say, that they are ignorant? think ye, that those ministering Angels who are called Intelligencers, give them no intelligence? or that they gather nothing of intelligence by looking him in the face, who is the fulnesse of knowledge, and to all these the practice and opinion of so Catholick a Church; God can onely forgive sins, Christ can onely mediate, but Saints, whether in heaven, or on the earth, may intercede for one another.

Lastly, for our worshipping of Images: confounded be all they that worshipped them, for me, God is onely worthy to be worshipped; but if I kneel before the Picture of my Saviour, I worship him kneeling before his Picture; the worship is in the heart, and not in the knee, and where the true God is in the intention, there can be no Idolatrie.

O Sir, Christian Religion is not a Protestation, but a Gospel: it would better consist with unity, then opposition: we hold it a peece of popery to knock our owne breasts with the fists of constitution, whilst we hold it most Evangelicall, to knock at our neighbours with a Constables staffe: a pious care in a Mother Church, labours to educate her own daughter, and having fed her at her owne breasts, all the gratitude she returns her mother, is to call her whore; Antichrist, Babylon, and all the spitefull and vile names that can be imagined; they forget that saying of the Apostle St. James: If any man among you seeme to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, that mans Religion is in vaine; Pure Religion, and undefiled before God, and the Father, is this: to visit the fatherlesse and widows, in their affliction, and to keep himselfe unspotted from the world. What should I say more, the Scriptures are made a nose of wax, for every bold hand to wring it which way he pleaseth, they are

rejected by private men, by whole books, *The Articles of our Creed* are said not to be of the *Apostles* framing, the *Commandments* not belonging to *Christians*, impossible to be kept, the *Sacraments* denied; *Charity* not onely grown cold, but quite starved, and they will be sav'd by meanes quite contrary to what the *Gospel* (which they seeme to professe) sets down, viz. by *Faith* without good works, onely believe and thats enough, whereas the holy *Apostle St. James* tells us, that *faith* profiteth nothing without good works.---
 "Here the *Marquess* was going on, and His *Majestie* interrupted him.

King. My Lord, you let a flood-gate of Arguments out, against my naked breast, yet it doth not beare me any thing backwards; you have spoken a great many things, that no way concerns Us, but such as we find fault with as much as you; and other things, to which I could easily give answer, If I could take but some of that time and leasure that you have taken to compose your Arguments. It is not onely the *Picture* of our *Saviour*, but the *Pictures* of *Saints* which you both worship and adore, and maintaine it to be lawfull; and not onely so, but the *Picture* of *God the Father*, like an old man, and many other things which I forbear, because I feare, you have done your selfe more hurt then me good, in depriving your selfe of the rest, to which you are accustomed; for whilst our Arguments do multiply our time lessens: to that of *Saint James*, where it is said, that *faith* profiteth nothing without good works; I hope the *Doctor* here can tell you, that *Saint Paul* saith, that we are justified by *Faith*, and not by the works of the Law.

Marq. Sir, I believe the *Doctor* will neither tell Your *Majestie*, nor me, that *Faith* can justify without works.

King

King. That question the Doctor can soone decide, what say you to it Doctor? you must speak now.

Doctor. If it may please Your Majestie, it would be as great a disobedience to hold my peace, now I am commanded to speak, as it would have been a presumption in me to speak before I was commanded; I am so far from thinking that either Faith, without good works, or that good works without Faith, can justifie: that I cannot believe that there is such a thing as either. No more then I can imagine, that there may be a tree bearing fruit, without a root: or that the Sun can be up, before it be day: or that a fire can have no heat; for although it be possible, that a man may do some good without Faith, yet he cannot do good works without it; for though we may naturally incline to some goodnesse, as flowers and plants naturally grow to perfection; Yet this good cannot be said to be wrought by tis, but by the hand of Faith; and Faith her selfe (where she is truly so) can no more stand still, then can the Sun in the Firmament, or refuse to let her light so shine before men, that they may see her good works, then the same Sun can appeare in the same Firmament, and dart no beams. And whilst Faith and good works strive for the proprietie of Justification; I do believe, they both exclude a third, which hath more right to our Justification then either. For that which we call Justification by Faith, is not properly Justification; but onely an apprehension of it: as that which we call Justification, by good works, is not properly Justification, but onely a Declaration of it, to be so: *exempli gratia*: I receive a pardon, my hand that receiv's it, doth not justifie; 'tis put in execution, and read in open Court, all this did not procure it me. Doubtlesse there is a reward for the righteous, doubtlesse there is a God that judgeth the Earth, wherefore upon this ground of beleefe, I work out my Salvation as well as I can: and do all the good that lies in my power. I do good works. Doubtlesse this man hath some reason for what he doth: it is because he hath store of Faith, which believes, there is a God, and that that God will accept of his endeavours, wherefore to him alone who hath given us Faith, and hath wrought all our good works in us can we properly attribute the tearme of Justification: *Justificatio apprehensiva*, we may conceive and beare in our hearts: *Justificatio*.

ificatio declarativa, we may shew with our hands : but *Justificatio Effectiva*, proper and effectuall Justification none can lay claim unto, but Christ alone, that as our sins were imputed unto Christ, so his righteousness might be ours by imputation.

King. Doctor, I thank you, in this point I believe you have reconciled us both.

Doctor. May it please Your Majestie, if the venome were taken out, there is no wound in the Churches body, but might soon be healed.

Marq. Hereat the Marquesse somewhat earnestly cryed, Hold Sir, You have said well in one respect, but there are two wayes of Justification in us : and two without us : Christ is a cause of Justification by his grace and merits without us ; and so we are justified by Baptisme, and we are justified by the gifts of God in us, viz. Faith, Hope, and Charity. Whereupon the King spake as quickly.

King. But my Lord, both Justifications come from Christ, according to your owne saying : That without us, by his grace and merit : that within us, by his gifts and favour ; therefore Christ is all in all, in the matter of Justification ; and therefore though there were a thousand wayes, and meanes to our Justification, yet there is but one effectuall cause, and that is Christ.

Marq. How is it then, that we are called by the Apostle, Cooperarii Christo, Fellow-workers together with Christ ?

King. The Doctor hath told you how already : If you lie wallowing in sin, and Christ helps you out, your reaching of him your hand is a working together with Christ ; Yet for all that, it cannot be said, that you helped your selfe out of the ditch : for then there had been no need of Christ. Your apprehending the succour that came unto you, no way attributes the God have mercie to your selfe : no more then the declaring your

your selfe to be alive by action ; is the cause of setting you upon your leggs, so that we may divide this three-fold Justification, as *Peter* divided his three Tabernacles, here is one for *Moses*, and one for *Elias* : I pray let us have one for *Christ*, and let that be the chiefe.

Marq. *And Reason good.*

King. I wish that all Controversies betwixt you and Us, were as well decided: I am fully satisfied in this point.

Doct^r. May it please Your Majestie : A great many Controversies between us and the Papists might be soon decided, if the Churches revenues (which were every where taken away, more or lesse, where differences in Religion in severall parts of the world, did arise in the Church) were not an obstacle of the reunion ; like the stone, which the Crab cast into the Oyster, which hindred it from ever shutting it selfe againe ; like the division, which happened between the *Greek* and *Latine* Church. *Photinus* intrudes himselfe into the Patriarch-ship of *Constantinople* over the head of *Ignatius*, the lawfull Patriarch thereof ; whom the Pope preserved in his Communion, and then the difference of the Proceſsion of the holy Ghost, between those two Churches, was fomented by the said *Photinus*, lest the wound should heale too soon, and the patient should not be held long enough in cure, for the benefit of the *Chyrurgion*. Sacriledge hath brought more divisions then the nature of their causes have required : and the Universities play with edged tools, whilst hungry stomachs run away with their meat ; wherefore since Your Majestie was pleased to discharge the watch, that I had set before the dore of my lips : I shall make bold to put Your Majestie in mind of holding my Lord to the demand which Your Majestie once made unto his Lordship, concerning the true Church ; for if once that Question were thoroughly determined, all Controversies not onely between Your Majestie and his Lordship, but also all the Controversies that ever were started, would soon be decided at a short race end ; and without this, we take away the meanes of reconciliation. For I must confesse ingenuously (yet under the highest correction) that there is not a thing that I ever under-

stood lesse, then that assertion, of the Scriptures being judge of Controversies, though in some sence I must, and will acknowledge it. but not as it is a book consisting of papers, words, and letters; for as we commonly say in matters of civill differences, the Law shall be the judge between us, we do not meane, that every man shall run unto the Law books, or that any Lawyer himselfe shall search his Law-cases, and thereupon possesse himselfe of any thing that is in question between him and another, without a legall tryall and determination by lawfull Judges, constituted to that same purpose: In like manner, saving knowledge and Divine Truths are the portion, that all Gods children lay fast claime unto: yet they must not be their own carvers, though it is their own meat that is before them, whilst they have a mother at the table; They must not slight all Orders, Constitutions, Appalears, and Rules of Faith; saving knowledge, and Divine Truths, are not to be wrested from the Scripture by private hands, for then the Scripture were of private interpretation: which is against the Apostles Rule. Neither are those undefiled, incorruptible and immaculate inheritances, which are reserved for us in heaven, to be conveyed unto us by any Privy-seales. For there is nothing more absurd, to my understanding, then to say, that the thing contested (which is the true meaning of the Scriptures) shall be Judge of the Contestation: no way inferiour to that absurditie, which would follow, which would be this, if we should leave the deciding of the sence of the words of the Law, to the preoccupied understanding of one of the Advocates; neither is this all the absurditie that doth arise upon this supposition: for if you grant this to one, you must grant it to any one, and to every one: if there were but two, how will you reconcile them both? If you grant that this judicature must be in many, there are many manyes, which of the manyes will you have? decide but that, and you satisfie all. For if you make the Scripture the Judge of Controversie, you make the reader Judge of the Scripture: as a man consists of a soule and body, so the Scripture consists of the letter and the sence; if I make the dead letter my Judge, I am the greatest, and simplest idolater in the world: it will tell me no more, then it told the *Indian* Emperour *Pomhaton*, who asking the Jesuite, how he knew all that to be true which he had told him

him, and the Jesuite answering him, that Gods word did tell him so. The Emperour asked him, where it was? he shewed him his Bible. The Emperour, after that he had held it in his hands a pretty while, answered, It tells me nothing. But you will say, you can read, and so you will find the meaning out of the significant Character; and when you have done, as you apprehend it, so it must be; and so the Scripture is nothing else but your meaning: wherefore necessitie requires an externall Judge, for determination of differences, besides the Scriptures. And we can have no better recourse to any, then to such as the Scripture it selfe calls upon us to heare, which is the Church, which Church would be found out.

King. Doctor, Saint *John* in his first Epistle tells us, that the holy Scripture is that, to whose truth the Spirit beareth witness. And *John* the Evangelist tells us, that the Scripture is that which gives a greater Testimonie of Christ, then *John* the Baptist. Saint *Luke* tells us, that if we believe not the Scripture, we would not believe though one were risen from the dead: and Christ himselfe, who raised men from death to life, tells us; they cannot believe his words, if they believe not in *Moses* writings: Saint *Peter* tells us, that the holy Scripture is surer then a voice from heaven: Saint *Paul* tells us, that it is lively in operation, and whereby the Spirits demonstrates his power; and that, it is able to make a man wise to salvation, able to save our soules; and that it is sufficient too to make us believe in Christ, to life everlasting, John 20. As in every seed, there is a Spirit, which meeting with earth, heat, and moisture, grows to perfection: so the seed of the word, wherein Gods holy Spirit being sown in the heart, invivified by the heart of faith, and watered with the teares of repentance) soon fructifies without any further Circumstance.

Doctor. It doth so, but Your Majestie presupposes all this while, husband-men, and husbandry, barnes and threshing floors,

winnowing and uniting these several grains into one loafe, before it can become childrens bread. All that Your Majestie hath said concerning the Scriptures sufficiencie, is true, provided, that those Scriptures be duly handled; for as the Law is sufficient to determine right, and keep all in peace and quietnesse, yet the execution of that sufficiencie, cannot be performed without Courts and Judges: so when we have granted the Scriptures to be all that the most reverend estimation can attribute unto them, yet Religion cannot be exercised, nor differences in Religion reconciled, without a Judge; For as Saint *Jerom* tells us, who was no great friend to Popes or Bishops: *Si non una, exors quadam, & imminens detur potestas, tot efficerentur in Ecclesia schismata quot Sacerdotes.* Wherefore I would faine find out that which the Scripture bids me heare, *Audi Ecclesiam*: I would faine referre my selfe to that to which the Scripture commands me to appeale, and tells me, that if I do not, I shall be a Heathen and a Publican, *Dic Ecclesia*: which Church Saint *Paul* in his first Epistle calls the pillar and foundation of Truth, of which the Prophet *Ezekiel* saith: *I will place my Sanctification in the midst of her for ever*: and the Prophet *Isay*, that the Lord would never forsake her, in whose light the people should walke, and Kings in the brightnesse of her Orient; Against which our Saviour saith: *The gates of Hell shall not prevaile*: with whom our Saviour saith, *He would be alwayes unto the end of the world.* And from whom the Spirit of Truth should never depart. For although the *Psalmist* tells us, that the word of the Lord is clear, inlightning the eyes, yet the same Prophet said to God: *Enlighten mine eyes, that I may see the marvels of thy Law*: And Saint *Iohn* tells us, that the booke of God hath seven Seals, and it was not every one that was thought worthy to open it, onely the lambe. The Disciples had been ignorant, if *Iesus* had not opened the Scriptures unto them. The *Eunuch* could not understand them without an Interpreter; and Saint *Peter* tells us, that the Scripture is not of private Interpretation: and that in his brother *Pauls* Epistles there are many things hard to be understood, which ignorant and light-headed-men wrest to their owne perdition. Wherefore though as Saint *Chrysostom* saith: *Omnia clara sunt & plana ex scripturis divinis: quaecunque necessaria sunt, manifesta sunt*: yet no man

ever hath yet defined what are necessary, and what not. What points are fundamentall, and what are not fundamentall. Necessary to Salvation is one thing, and necessary for knowledge, as an improvement of our faith, is another thing : for the first, if a man keeps the Commandments, and believes all the Articles of the Creed, he may be saved, though he never read a word of Scripture ; but much more assuredly if he meditates upon Gods word with the *Psalmist* day and night. But if he meanes to walk by the rule of Gods word, and to search the Scriptures, he must lay hold upon the meanes that God hath ordained, whereby he may attaine unto the true understanding of them ; for as Saint *Paul* saith : *God hath placed in the Church Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Doctors*, to the end we should be no more little children, blown about with every wind of Doctrine ; therefore it is not for babes in understanding to take upon them to understand those things, wherein so great a Prophet as the Prophet *David* confessed the darknesse of his owne ignorance. And though it be true, the Scripture is a river through which a lambe may wade, and an Elephant may swim, yet it is to be supposed and understood, that the lambe must wade but onely through, where the river is foordable ; It doth not suppose the river to be all alike in depth, for such a river was never heard of ; but there may be places in the river, where the lambe may swim as well as the Elephant, otherwise it is impossible that an Elephant should swim in the same depth, where a lambe may wade, though in the same river he may ; neither is it the meaning of that place, that the child of God may wade through the Scripture without directions, help, or Judges, but that the meannest capacitie, qualified with a harmelesse innocence, and desirous to wade through that river of living waters to eternall life, may find so much of Comfort, and heavenly knowledge there, easily to be obtained, that he may easily wade through to his eternall Salvation ; and that there are also places in the same river, wherein the highest speculations may plunge themselves, in the deep mysteries of God. Wherefore with pardon crav'd for my presumption, in holding Your Majestie in so tedious a discourse, as also, for my boldnesse in obtruding my opinion, which is except (as incomparable *Hooker* in his Ecclesiasticall pollicy hath well observed) the Churches Au-

thority be required herein, as necessary hereunto we shall be so far from agreeing upon the true meaning of the Scripture; that the outward letter sealed with the inward witnesse of the Spirit (being all hereticks have quoted Scripture and pretended Spirit) will not be a warrant sufficient enough, for any private man to judge so much as the Scripture to be Scripture: or the Gospell it selfe, to be the Gospell of Christ: This Church being found out, and her Authority allowed of, all controversies would be soone decided, and although we allow the Scripture to be the lock upon the door, which is Christ, yet we must allow the Church to be the Key, that must open it; as Saint Ambrose in his 38. Sermons calls the agreement of the Apostles in the Articles of our beleefe, *Clavis Scripturae*, one of whose Articles is, I believe the holy Catholick Church. As the Lion wants neither strength, nor courage, nor power, nor weapons, to seize upon his prey, yet he wants a nose to find it out: wherefore by natural instinct, he takes to his assistance, the little Jack-call, a quick sented beast, who runs before the Lion, and having found out the prey, in his language gives the Lion notice of it, who soberly (untill such time as he fixes his eyes upon the bootie) makes his advance, but once comming within view of it, with a more speed then the swiftest running can make, he jumps upon it, and seizes it. Now to apply this to our purpose.

Christ crucified is the main substance of the Gospell, according to the Apostles saying, *I desire to know nothing, but Jesus, and him crucified*; This crucified Christ is the nourishment of our soules, according to our Saviours own words: *Ohi Cadaver, ibi aquila*; Thereby drawing his Disciples from the curious speculation of his body glorified, to the profitable meditation of his body crucified: It is the prey of the Elect: the dead Carcasse feedeth the Eagles, Christ crucified nourisheth his Saints: according to Saint Johns saying, *except we eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, we have no life in us*; him we must masticate, and chew by faith: traject, and convey him into our hearts as nutriment, by meditation: and digest him by Coalition, whereby we grow one with Christ, and Christ becomes one with us, according to that saying of Tertullian, *Audis devorandus est; intellectu rummandus; fide digerendus*.

Now

Now for the true understanding of the Scriptures, which is no other thing, then the finding out of *Iesus*, and him crucified, who is the very life of the Scriptures; which body of Divinity, is nourished with no other food, and all its veines fill'd with no other blood: though this heavenly food (the Scripture) have neither force nor power to seize upon its prey, but is endued with a lively spirit, able to overcome the greatest ignorance, yet there is a quick sented assilant called *Ecclesia*, or Church, which is derived from a *verbe*, which signifies to call, which must be the Jack-call, to which this powerfull seeker after this prey must joync it selfe, or else it will never be able to find it out; and when we are called, we must go soberly to work, untill by this means we have attained unto the true understanding and sight thereof, and then, let the Lion, like the Eagle, *Maher-shalal-hushbaz* (as the Prophet *Esay* cap. 8. v. 3. tells us,) make hast to the prey, make speed to the spoile. Saint *Paul* confirms the use of this Etymologie writing to the *Corinthians*, viz. To the Saints called; and the *Ephe-sians* cap. 4. he tells us, if ye would be in one body, and in one spirit, and of one mind, you must be as you are called in our hope of your vocation: and in his Epistle of the *Colossians* cap. 3. he tells us, that if we will have the peace of *Christ* to rule in our hearts, that is it by which we are called in one selfe body, where we must allow a constitution or Society of men called to that purpose, and whose calling it is to procure unto us this peace and unitie in the Church, or we shall never find it. Thus when dissention arose between *Paul* and *Barnabas* concerning Circumcision, their disputations could effect nothing but heat, untill the Apostles and Elders met together, and determined the matter: there must be a Society of men that can say, *Bene visum fuit nobis & Spiritui sancto*, or else matters of that nature will never be determined: which societie is there called the Church, which Church we are to find.

King. I pray, my Lord, what doe you meane by the holy Catholick Church, doe you meane the Church of *Rome*?

Marq. I doe so.

King. My thinks it should be inconsistent with it, to be both universall, and particular.

Marq.

Marq. No more then it is inconsistent, for the Generall of Your Army to be Generall of all Your Officers and Souldiers, and yet a particular man. By the word Roman, we intend not the particular Church of Rome, but all the Churches which adhere and are joyned in Communion with the Roman Church, as by the Jewish Church, was not onely meant the Church of Judah onely, but of all the other Tribes which had Communion with her; the word Catholick is taken in three severall sences, formally, casually, and participatively: In the first sence, the Societie of all the true particular Churches, united in one selfe-same Communion, is called Catholick; Casually, the Roman Church is called Catholick, for as much as she infuseth universalitie into all the whole body of the Catholick Church; wherefore being a Center and beginning of Ecclesiasticall Communion, infusing unitie, which is the form of universalitie, into the Catholick Church, she may be called Catholick: Participatively, because particular Churches agree, and participate in Doctrine and Communion with the Catholick.

King. You have satisfied me why the Church of Rome (in your sence) may be called Catholick, but you have not yet satisfied me, why other Churches may not be called (casually) as much Catholick as she: being the Greek Church hath infused as much universalitie into the whole body of the Catholick Church as she did, and was both center and circumference, as much as ever she was.

Marq. Sir, as to this point, I shall refer your Majestie to the learned reply, that the profound Card. Peroon, so respectfully and learnedly made to Your royall Father his Apologie, wherein this point is largely and (to my apprehension) fully answered. But will Your Majestie either give or take,

take, either let me shew you this Church, or else doe Your Majestie shew it me.

King. My Lord, if you can shew it me, I shall not shut mine eyes against it; But at this time, truly my Lord, I can hardly hold them open. My Lord, I pray will you set downe your mind in writing, and I will promise you it shall want no animadversion, and that I will give you my clear opinion concerning it.

Marq. *O Sir! Literæ scriptæ manent; I doe not like, that what I speak here to your Majestie, I can promise my selfe, so much from your goodnesse, that no bad Construction shall be made of what I speak. But if my writing should come into other folks hands, I may justly fear their comments: wherefore I desire to be excused.*

King. My Lord, I hold it more convenient so to doe: I will promise you, that I will let no eyes but mine owne view your Paper: and I will returne it to you againe by the Doctor.

Marq. *Upon that Condition I am contented: I have one request more unto your Majestie: that You would make one Prayer to God, to direct You in the right way: and that You would lay aside all prejudice, and selfe-interest, and that You will not so much fear the Subject, as the Superiour, who is over all, and then You cannot doe amisse.*

King. My Lord, all this shall be done, by the Grace of God.

Whereupon the Marquesse called upon me to help him, so that he might kneel; and being upon his knees, he desired to kisse His Majesties hand, which he did, saying:

Sir, I have not a thought in my heart, that tends not to the service of my God, and you: and if I could have resisted

this motion of his Spirit, I had desisted long ago, but I could
 not: wherefore on both my knees, I pray to his Divine
 Majestie, that he will not be wanting to his owne Ordinance,
 but will direct Your understanding to those things, which
 shall make You a happy King upon Earth, and a Saint in
 Heaven; "And thereupon he fell aweeping, bidding me
 "to light His Majestie to His Chamber. As the King was
 "going, he said unto the Marquesse: My Lord, it is great
 pittie, that you should be in the wrong: "Whereat the
 Marquesse soone replied: It is greater pittie, that You
 should not be in the right. "The King said: God direct
 us both: The Marquesse said: Amen, Amen, I pray God.
 "Thus they both parted: and (as I was lighting His Ma-
 "jestic to His Chamber,) His Majestie told me, that he did
 "not think to have found the old man so ready at it, and
 "that he believed, he was a long time putting on his ar-
 "mour: yet it was hardly proove. To which I made an-
 "swer, that I believe, his Lordship had more reason to
 "wonder, how His Majestie (so unprepared) could with-
 "stand the on-set. The King (being brought to His doer,)
 "commanded me, that before I brought him his Lordships
 "Paper, I should peruse it, and give him my opinion of it.
 "Which I promised to obey, and so returned to the Mar-
 "quesse, whom I found in the dark upon his knees, whom I
 "did not disturbe, but when he rose, he said unto me: Do-
 "ctor, I will tell you what I was doing, I was giving God
 thanks, that he had preserved the use of my memory for so
 good a work, and imploring a blessing upon my endeavours.
 "To which I made answer: My Lord, no question but you
 "think it a good work, or else you would not implore Gods
 "blessing upon it. Whereupon my Lord said: Ah! Doctor,
 I would to God you thought so too: "And waiting upon him
 "into his Chamber, he further said unto me: Doctor Bayly,

you

you know I am obliged not to speak unto you in this nature, yet I hope I may say thus much unto you, without any breach of promise, you may be an Instrument of the greatest good that ever befell this Nation. I say no more: Good night to you.

The third day after, he gave me this Paper to deliver unto His Majestie, which I did.

The Marquesse his Paper to the King.

IT must be granted by all, that there must be (alwayes) in the world, one holy, Catholick, and Apostolique Church: one, that it may be uniforme: holy, that it may be certaine: Catholick, that it may be knowne: and Apostolick, that it may succeed: this Church must be either the Romane, or the Protestant, or else some other that is opposite to both. It cannot be any Church which is opposite to both: because the Church of England did not (when she separated from the Romane) joyn her selfe to any: not to the Grecian: for that holds as many Doctrines contrary to the Church of England, as doth the Roman; nor to any else, because she agrees with none, no reformed Church under the Sun, that is, or ever was, hath the same articles of beliefe, as hath the Church of England. And from any other Church, besides the Romane, she never had a being: and with any other Church besides the Romane, she never had Communion; She cannot be that one, because she is but one: nor Catholick, because she agrees not with any: nor Apostolick, because she hath acknowledged such a fine and recovery, that has quite cut off the entaile which would have (otherwise) descended unto her from the Apostles; neither can she be holy, because she is none of all the other three. Now if these Attributes cannot belong unto the Protestant

Religion, and do (clearly) belong unto the Roman, then is the Church of Rome, the Catholick Church. And that it doth, I shall prove it by the marks, which God Almighty hath given us, whereby we should know her.

And the first is Universality: All Nations shall flow unto her, Esa. 2. 2. And the Psalmist: The heathen shall be thine inheritance, and the uttermost part of the Earth for thy possession, Psal. 2. 2. And our Saviour Matth. 20. 14. This Gospell of the Kingdome shall be preached in all the world, as a witnesse to all Nations, &c. Now I confesse, that this glory is belonging to all Professors of the Christian Religion: yet amongst all those, who do professe the name of Christ, I believe, Your Majestie will consent with me herein, that the Romane Church hath this forme of universality, not onely above all different and distinct Professors of Religion, but also beyond all Religions of the world, Turkes or Heathens: and that there is no place in the world, where there are not Romane Catholicks; which is manifestly wanting to all other Religions, whatsoever: Now I hope Your Majestie cannot say so of any Protestant Religion: neither that Your Majestie will call all those who protest against the Church of Rome, otherwise then Protestants: but not Protestant Catholicks, or Catholicks of the Protestant Religion, being they are not religated within the same Communion, and fellowships: for then Religion would consist in protestation rather then unity; in Nations falling off from one another, rather then all Nations flowing to one another: neither is it a Consideration altogether invalid, that the Church of Rome hath kept possession of the name; all along other reformed Churches, leaving her in possession of the name, and taking unto themselves new names according to their severall founders: except the Church of England, (who is now her selfe become.

come like a Chapter that is full of nothing else) whose soun-
der was such a one, whose name it may be they were unwill-
ing to owne.

For antiquity, if we should inquire after the old paths,
which is the good way, and walke therein; as the Prophet
Jeremiah adviseth us: if we should take our Saviours rule,
Ab initio autem, non fuit sic: if we should observe his
saying, how the good seed was first sowed, and then the
tares: If we should consider the pit from whence we were
dug, and the rock from whence we were hewen, we shall
find antiquity more applicatory to the Church of Rome,
then any Protestant Church. But you will say, your Reli-
gion is as ancient as ours; having its procedure from
Christ, and his Apostles: so say the Lutheran Protestants,
with their Doctrine of Consubstantiation: and many other
sorts of Protestants, having other Tenents, altogether
contrary to what you hold: how shall we reconcile you? so
say all hereticks that ever were, how shall we confute them?
a part to set up themselves against the whole, and by the
power of the sword, to make themselves Judges in their
owne causes, is dealing, that were it your case, I am sure
you would think it very hard, I wish you may never find
it so.

For Visibility: Our Saviour compares his Church to a Citie
placed on a hill, according unto the Prophet Davids Pro-
phesie, a Tabernacle in the Sun: It is likewise compared
unto a candle in a candle-stick: not under a bushell: and
saith our Saviour, If they shall say unto you, behold,
he is in the desert, go ye not forth; Behold, He is in se-
cret places, believe it not; forewarning us against obscure
and invisible Congregations: Now I beseech Your Maje-
stie, whether should I betake my selfe, to a Church that was
alwayes visible, and gloriously eminent; or to a Protestant

Church that was never eminent, and for the most part invisible; shrowding their defection, under an Apostolicall Expression, of a woman in the Revelation, who fled into the wilderness for a thousand years: as if an allegory, could wipe out so many clear texts of Scripture, as are set down by our Saviour, and the Prophets, concerning the Churches invisibility? And I could not find any Church in the world to whom that Prophecie of Esay might more fitly appertain, then to the Church of Rome: I have set watch-men upon the walls, which shall never hold their peace day nor night, which I am sure no Protestant Church can apply to her selfe.

It is not enough to say, I maintaine the same Faith and Religion which the Apostles taught, and therefore, I am of the true Church, ancient, and visible enough; because (as I have said before) every heretick will say as much: but if you cannot by these marks of the Church, (set down in Scripture) clear your selves to be the true Church, you vainly appeale to the Scriptures siding with you in any particular point: for what can be more absurd, then to appeale from Scripture, (setting things down clearly) unto Scripture setting down things more obscurely? There is no particular point of Doctrine in the holy Scripture so manifestly set downe, as that concerning the Church, and the Markes thereof: nothing set down more copious and perspicuous then the visibility, perpetuities, and amplitude of the Church.

So that Saint Augustin did not stick to say, that the Scriptures were more clear about the Church, then they were about Christ. Let him answer for it. He said so in his book, de unitate Ecclesiae, and this (he said) was the reason: because, God (in his wisdom) would have the Church to be described without any ambiguity, that all Controversies

ties about the Church may be clearly decided : whereby questions about particular Doctrines, may find determinations in her judgement : and that Visibilty might shew the way unto the most rude and ignorant : and I know not any Church, to whom it may more justly be attributed, then to the Church of Rome : whose Faith (as in the beginning was spread through the whole world) so (all along) and at this day, it is generally known among all nations. Next to this, I prove the Catholick Church to be the Romane ; because, a lawfull succession of Pastors is required in every true Church, according to the Prophet Esay his Prophecie concerning her, viz. My Spirit which is upon thee, and the words which I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seeds seed, from henceforth, for ever ; This succession I can find onely in the Church of Rome : This succession they onely can prove ; none else offering to go about it. This succession Saint Augustin sayes, kept him in that Church, viz. a succession of Priests, from the very seat of Peter the Apostle, to the present Bishop of his time. And Optatus Milevitanus reckons all the Romane Bishops from Saint Peter to Syricius, who then was Pope : and by this, he shewed and made it his Argument, that the true Church was not with the Donatists : bidding them, to shew the Originall of their Chayre ; this no Protestant did, or ever can doe : The Romane Church gave the English Bishops Commission to preach the Doctrine of Christ, as they have delivered it unto them ; but they never gave them any Commission to preach against her Religion : which Bishops being turned out, for observing the depositum (wherewith they were instructed) and new Bishops chosen in their room (by her, who not contenting her selfe with being a nursing mother thereof, must needs

needs be head of the child : and moderatrix in the same Church, wherein by the Apostles precept she is forbidaen to (speak) the succession was broke off : the branch cut off from the body, becoming no part of the tree, fit for nothing but to be chopt into smaller pieces, and so fitted for the fire ; this prooffe of succession the Bishops of England, thought so necessary, for proving their Church to be the true Church, that they affirmed themselves to be consecrated by Catholick Bishops, their Predecessors, which (never proved) argues the interruption, and affirming it, shews how that (in their owne opinion) the succession could not hold in the inferiour Ministers (as indeed it cannot) for as there is a continued supply of Embassadors in all places, yet the succession is in the royall race : so though all vacancies are replenished by Ministers of the Gospel, yet the succession of the Authority was in the Bishops, as descended (to them) from the Apostles, according to our Saviours rule : I will be with you alwayes unto the end of the world ; Which Affirmation of theirs, argues that their calling is sufficient without it : and in that they would faine derive it from the Church of Rome, it argues, that that is the true Church : and yet they would forsake her, supposing her to have errors, when that Reformation it selfe was but a supposition ; for seeing they hold that their Church may erre, they can be certain of nothing : and whilst (for errors sake) they forsake the Church of Rome, the Church of England (in forsaking her) may be in the greatest error of all : where there is neither Succession, nor assurance, I must leave her to her selfe, and your Majestie to judge.

Next : I prove the Romane Church, to be the true Church, by her unity in Doctrine : for so the Apostle Paul requires all the Churches children to be of one mind. *viz.* I beseech you, that all speak one thing ; Be ye knit together

gether in one mind, and one Judgement, 1 Cor. 1. Endeavouring to keep the unitie of the Spirit in the bond of peace, Ephes. 4. 3. The multitude of them that believed, were of one heart, and of one soul, Act. 4. 32. Continue in one Spirit and one mind, of one accord and one judgement, Phil. 1. 27. Phil. 2. 2. So our Saviour prayeth that they may be one; So Joseph forewarned his brethren, that they should not fall out by the way, knowing that whilst they were with him, he could order them: when they came to their father, he could order them: but having no head, they should be apt to be dissentious. This Unity I find no where but in the Church of Rome: agreeing in all things, which the Church of Rome hath determined for Doctrine, whereas the Protestant Doctrine, like the heresie of Simon Magus, divided it selfe into severall Sects, and to that of the Donatists which were cut into small threds, in so much, that among the many Religions which are lately sprung up, and the sub, sub, sub-divisions under them: each one (pretending to be the true Protestant) excluding the other: and all of them together, no more likely to be bound up in the bond of peace, then a bundle of thornes, can expect binding with a rope of sand; In vaine is their excuse, if non-disagreement in fundameatalls: for they disagree amongst themselves about the Sacrament: for the Lutherans hold Consubstantiation: but the Church of England no such matter.

Some, that Christ descended into hell: others not. The Church of England maintain their King to be the head of the Church: The Helvetians will acknowledge no such matter: the Presbyterians will acknowledge no such matter, the Independent will acknowledge no such matter: Concerning the Government of the Church by Bishops, some Protestants maintaine it to be Jure Divino: others,

Lincol. min.
to K. James,
pag. 11. 13.

Chem. Ex.
Contr. Trid.
part. 1. pag. 55.
Also:

Eucher. p. 63.

to be Jure Ecclesiastico, others no such matter. Some think that the English translations of the Bible in some places takes away, in other places adds, and other some places changes the meaning of the holy Ghost, and some think it no such matter, or else the Bishops would not have recommended it unto the people. Lastly, they are so far from agreeing about the true meaning of the word of God, that they cannot agree upon what is the word of God: For Lutherans, deny the second Epistle of Saint Peter, the second and third Epistle of Saint John: the Epistle to the Hebr. the Epistle of Saint James, and Saint Jude, and the Revelation; The Calvinists and the Church of England, no such matter, they allow them. And I believe that these are fundamentalls; If they cannot agree upon their Principalls, how shall they agree upon the deductions thence? If these be not fundamentall points, how come Protestants, to fight against Protestants, for the Protestants Religion?

The disagreement is not so amongst the Romane Catholics: for all points of the Romane Religion, that have been defined by the Church, in a generall Council, are agreed upon exactly, by all nations, tongues and people, ubique terrarum: but in those points which are not determined by the Church, the Church leaves every man to abide in his owne sense; and therefore all the heat that is either between the Thomists and the Scollists: the Dominicans, and the Jesuits: either concerning the Conception of our blessed Lady, or the concurrence of Grace, and free-will, &c. being points, wherein the Church hath not interposed her decrees, is no more prejudicall or objectionall against the Church of Romes Unity, then the disputations in the Schools of our Universities are prejudicall to the 39. Articles of the Church of England. But in each severall

severall Protestant Dominions there are certain severall Articles of beliefe, belonging to severall Protestant Dominions, in which severall agreements, not any one, agrees with any of all the rest; neither is there any possibility they should: heing there is no means acknowledged, nor power ordained, whereby they should be gathered together in one councill, whereby they might be of one heart, and of one soule: neither is there this Unitie in any one particular Dominion: as is in the Dominion of the Roman Church; for they are all in pieces amongst themselves, even in their owne severall Dominions, practising disobedience to their Superiours, they teach it to their Inferiours.

The greatest Unitie the Protestants have, is not in believing, but in not believing: in knowing, rather what they are against, than what they are for; not so much in knowing what they would have, as in knowing what they would not have. But let these negative Religions take heed they meet not with a negative Salvation.

Neither can the Conversion of Nations be attributed to any other Church then to the Roman, which is another mark of the true Church, according to the Prophecies of Esay cap. 49. 23. Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and Queens thy nursing mothers. And Esay 60. 16. Thou shalt suck the milk of the Gentiles, and the breasts of Kings shall minister unto thee: And Esay 60. 10. And thy Gates shall be continually open, that men may bring to thee the riches of the Gentiles, and that their Kings may be brought. And the Isles shall doe thee service. And the Prophet David, I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession, &c. Now no Protestant Church ever converted any one Nation, Kingdome or People. Many Protestant people have fallen away from the

Church of Rome, but this cannot be called conversion, but rather perversion: for the Romane Church may justly say of such, these have not converted Nations from paganism to Christianity, which is the mark of the true Church: These are they, which went forth from us, 1 Joh. 2. 19. Certaine that went forth from us, Act. 15. 14. These are certaine men who rise out of our selves, speaking perverse things, Act. 20. 30. These were they who separated themselves, Jude 19. which are marks of false and hereticall Churches. But the Romane Church I find stretcheth forth her armes, from East to West, receiving and embracing all within her Communion; For the first three hundred years, the Church grew down-ward, like a strong building, whose foundations are first laid in the earth, whose stones are knit together in Unity by the mortar that was tempered with the blood of her ten Persecutions. Afterwards this building, hasting upwards, Constantine the great Emperour, submitting his neck unto the yoke of Christ, subdued all Christian Churches to Pope Sylvester, then Pope of Rome, from which time to these our dayes the Pope and his Clergy hath possessed the outward and visible Church as is confessed by Napier, a learned Protestant in his treatise upon the Revelation pag. 145. and all along hath added Kingdomes upon Kingdoms to her Communion: untill she had incorporated into her selfe, not onely Europe, but Asia, Africa and America: as Simon Lythus, a Protestant writer, affirmeth, viz. The Jesuits have filled Asia, Africa and America with their Idols (as he calls them) for the late Conversions of the East and West-Indies by the Romans, if you read Joan. Petrus Maffeus Hist. Indicarum, Jos. Acofta de natur. novi orbis: You shall find that no Church in the world hath ever spread so farre and wide, as the Church

Church of Rome. Wherefore I hope in this respect (also) I may safely conclude that the Church of Rome most justly deserves to be called the Catholick Church.

Neither is it a vainer thing, to say, that the Pope of Rome cannot be head of the Church, because Christ himselfe is head thereof; then it is for a man to say, that the King of England cannot be King of England, because God is King of all the earth, Psal. 46. 8. As if the King could not be Gods Vice-gerent, and the peoples visible God: so the Pope Christs Vicar or Deputy, and the Churches visible head. And let Kings beware how they give way to such Arguments as these, lest at the last such inferences be made upon themselves.

As strange an inference is that, how that the Church was not built upon Peter, because it was built upon his Confession; as if it might not be built casually upon the one, and formally upon the other: as if both these could not stand together. As if the Confession of Peters Faith might not be the cause why Christ built his Church upon his Person; as if Christ did not as well (personally) tell him, Tu es Petrus: as (significantly) super hanc Petram (id est, super istam Confessionem) ædificabo Ecclesiam.

No lesse invalid is that Objection of Protestants against the æconomacy of the Bishop of Rome, viz. that saying of Greg. sometimes Bishop of that sea, viz. He that intituled himself universall Bishop, exalted himself like Lucifer, above his brethren, and was a fore-runner of Antichrist: As if there were no more meanings in the word Uniuersality than one: as if there were not a Metaphoricall as well as a Literall and Grammaticall sense: as if Saint Gregory might not censure this title of Uniuersality in the Grammaticall, and exclusive meaning, (which being so taken, would have excluded all other Bishops from their

Offices, Essences, and Proprieties which they held under Christ) thereby depriving them of the Key of orders; and yet still keep the Superiority, (viz. of one Bishop over another, and himself over all in a Metaphoricall and transferent sense) thereby still keeping the Key of Jurisdiction in his own hands; and this not onely is, but must be the meaning of Saint Gregory; for he thus explicates the matter himself, lib. 4. ind. 13. ep. 32. viz. The care of the Church hath been committed to the Prince of all the Apostles, Saint Peter: and yet had Saint Peter called himselfe the Universall Apostle; in the first sence (seeing that Christ Jesus made other Apostles as well as him) he had been no Apostle himself, but Antichrist; and yet this hindered not, but that the care and principality was committed unto Peter: Whereby you may plainly see, how he ascribes a head-ship over the Church, whilst he denies the Universality of Episcopacy. Wherefore, having shewed Your Majesty my Church, I humble beg, that You will be pleased either to give me a few lines in answer hereunto, or else to shew me Yours.

*The KINGS Paper in Answer to
the Marquesse.*

MY Lord: I have perused your Paper, whereby I find, that it is no strange thing to see Errour triumph in Antiquity, and flourish all those Ensignes of Universality, Succession, Unity, Conversion of Nations, &c. in the face of Truth: and nothing was so familiar either with the Jews, or Gentiles, as to besmear the face of Truth with spots of novelty: For this was *peremialis*

miab's case, Jer. 44. 16. viz. As for the word which thou hast spoken unto us in the Name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee, but we will certainly doe whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our owne mouths: to burn incense unto the Queen of heaven, and to powre out drink-offerings unto her as we have done, we, and our fathers, our Kings and our Princes in the Cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem as we have done: there is Antiquity, we and our Fathers: there is Succession, In the Cities of Judah and Jerusalem: There is Universalitie: so Demetrius, urged Antiquity and Universality for his godde's sake: viz. That her Temple should not be despoiled, nor her Magnificence destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshipped. So Symachus that wise Senator, though a bitter enemy to the Christians: *Servanda est inquit tot seculis fides, & sequendi sunt nobis parentes qui feliciter sequuti sunt suos*: we must defend that Religion which hath worne out so many ages, and follow our Fathers steps, who have so happily followed theirs. So Prudentius would have put back Christianity its selfe, viz. *Nunc dogma nobis Christianum nascitur post evolutos mille annorum Consules*: Now the Christian Doctrine begins to spring up after the revolution of a thousand Consul-ships: But Ezekiel reads us another lecture. *Ne obdurate cervices vestras ut patres vestri, cedite manum Jehovae, ingredimini sanctuarium ejus, quod sanctificavit in saeculum, & colite Jehovam Deum vestrum*: Be not stiff-necked as your forefathers were, resist not the mighty God, enter into his Sanctuary which he hath consecrated for ever, and worship ye the Lord your God.

Radbodus, King of Phrygia, (being about to be baptized) asked the Bishop, what was become of all his ancestors, who were dead without being baptized.

The Bishop

Bishop answered: that they were all in hell; whereupon the King suddenly withdrew himselfe from the font, (saying) *Ibi professio me illis Comitum adiungam: Thither will I go unto them*: no lesse wise are they, who had rather erre with fathers and Councils, then rectifie their understanding by the word of God, and square their faith according to its rules.

Our Saviour Christ saith, we must not so much *hearken to what has been said by them of old time*, Mar. 21. 12. as to that which *he shall tell you*; where *Anditis dictum esse antiquis* is exploded: and *Ego dico vobis* is come in its place, which of them all can attribute that credit to be given unto him, as is to be given to Saint Paul. Yet he would not have us to be followers of him more, then he is a follower of Christ, 1 Cor. 11. 1. Wherefore if you cry never so loud, *Sancta mater Ecclesia, sancta mater Ecclesia*, the holy mother Church, holy mother Church as of old, they had nothing to say for themselves, but *Templum Domini, Templum Domini*, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, we will cry as loud againe with the Prophet: *Quomodo facta est meretrix Urbs fidelis?* how is the faith full City become a harlot: if you vaunt never so much of your Roman Catholick Church: we can tell you out of Saint John, that she is become the Synagogue of Sathan: neither is it impossible, but that the house of prayers may be made a Den of theeves: you call us hereticks; we answer you with Saint Paul, Act. 24. 14. *After the way which you call heresie, so worship we the God of our fathers, believing all things which were written in the Law and the Prophets.*

I will grant you, that all those marks which you have set downe, are marks of the true Church; and I will grant you more, that they were belonging to the Church
of

of *Rome*: but then you must grant me thus much, that they are as well belonging to any other Church, who hold and maintaine that Doctrine which the Church of *Rome* then maintained, when she wrought those conversions: and not at all to her, if she have changed her first love, and fallen from her old principles; for it will do her no good to keep possession of the keyes, when the lock is changed: now to try whether she hath done so or no, there can be no better way, then by searching the Scriptures; for though I grant you that the Catholick Church is the white in that Butt of earth at which we all must aime; yet the Scripture is the heart centre, or peg in the midst of that white that holds it up, from whence we must measure, especially when we are all in the white. We are all of us in *gremio Ecclesie*; so that controversies cannot be decided by the Catholick Church, but by the Scriptures, which is the thing by which the nearenesse unto truth must be decided; for that which must determine truth must not be fallible: but whether you mean the consent of Fathers, or the decrees of generall Counsels, they both have erred; I discover no Fathers nakednesse; but deplore their infirmities, that we should not trust in armes of flesh: *Tertulian* was a montanist, *Cyprian* a rebaptist; *Origen*, an Anthropomorphist; *Heirom*, a Monoganist; *Naxianzen*, an Angelist; *Eusebius*, an Arrian; Saint *Augustine* had written so many errors, as occasioned the writing of a whole booke of retractations: they have often times contradicted one another, and sometimes themselves.

Now for generall Counsels: Did not that *Concilium Ariminense*, conclude for the Arrian heresie? Did not that *Concilium Ephesinum*, conclude for the Eutichian heresie? Did not that *Concilium Carthaginense*,

conclude it not lawfull for Priests to marry? Was not *Athanasius* condemned *In concilio Tyrio*? Was not *Eiconolatria* established *In concilio Nicano secundo*?

What should I say more? when the Apostles themselves, lesse obnoxious to error, either in life or doctrine, more to be preferred then any, or all the world besides; one of them betraies his Saviour, another denies him; all forsake him. They thought *Christs Kingdome to have been of this world*; and a promise onely unto the Jewes, and not unto the Gentiles; and this after the resurrection.

They wondered that *the holy Ghost should fall upon the Gentiles*. Saint *John* twice worshipped the Angel, and was rebuked for it, *Apoc.* 22. 8. Saint *Paul* saw how *Peter* walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the Gospel, *Gal.* 2. 14. Not onely *Peter*, but other of the Apostles, were ignorant, how the word of God was to be preached unto the Gentiles.

But who then shall rowl away the stone from the mouth of the monument? Who shall expound the Scriptures to us? one pulls one way, and another another: by whom shall we be directed?

Scinditur incertum studia in contraria vulgus.

You that cry up the Fathers, the Fathers so much; shall hear how the Fathers doe tell us that the Scriptures are their owne interpreters.

Irenaeus, who was scholler to *Policarpus*, that was schollar to Saint *John*, lib. 3. cap. 12. thus saith, *Ostentiones quae sunt in Scripturis non possunt ostendi nisi ex ipsis Scripturis* &c, the evidences which are in Scripture cannot be manifested but out of the same Scripture.

Clemens Alexandrinus, *Nos ex ipsis de ipsis Scripturis,*
perfecte

perfecte demonstrantes ex fide persuademus demonstrative:
Strom. li. 7. Out of the Scriptures themselves, from the
 same Scriptures perfectly demonstrating, doe we draw
 demonstrative persuasions from faith.

Crysoft. *Sacra Scriptura seipsam exponit, & auditorem
 errare non sinit.* Basilii Magni, *Quae ambigunt & quae
 obscurae, videntur dici in quibusdam locis sacra Scriptura,
 ab iis quae in aliis locis aperta & perspicua sunt explicantur,*
 Hom: 13. in Gen. Those things which may seeme to be
 ambiguous and obscure in certaine places of the holy
 Scripture, must be explicated from those places which
 else-where are plain and manifest.

Augustinus, *Ille qui cor habet quod precisum est jungat
 Scripturam, & legat superiora vel inferiora & inveniet
 sensum.* Let him who hath a precise heart joine it unto
 the Scriptures: and let him observe what goes before,
 and that which follows after, and he shall find out the
 sense.

Questionum
 asceticarum se-
 cundum ept
 regula trecenti-
 sima sexa-
 gesima.

Gregorius saith (Ser. 49. De verbis Domini.) *Per
 Scripturam loquitur Deus omne quod vult: & voluntas
 dei sicut in testamento, sic in evangelio inquiratur.* By
 Scripture God speaks his whole mind; and the will of
 God, as in the old Testament so in the new, is to be
 found out.

Optatus contra Parmenonem, lib. 5. *Num quis aequior
 arbitet. veritatis divina quam Deus, aut ubi deus mani-
 festius loquitur quam in verbo suo:* Is there a better
 judge of the divine verity then God himselfe: or where
 doth God more manifestly declare himselfe then in his
 owne word:

What breath shall we believe then, but that which is
 the breath of God; the holy Scriptures: for it seems
 all one to Saint Paul to say, *dicit Scriptura,* the Scrip-

ture saith: *Rom. 4. 3. and dicit Deus the Lord saith: Rom. 9. 17. The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, Gal. 3. 22. for that which Rom. 11. 32. he saith, God hath concluded all, &c.* how shall we otherwise conclude then but with the Apostle *1 Cor. 2. 12. have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given unto us of God.*

They who know not this spirit, do deride it: but this spirit is *hidden Manna, Apo. 2. 17.* which God giveth them to eat who shall overcome; it is the white stone wherein the new name is written, which no man knoweth but he that received it. Wherefore we see the Scripture is the rule by which all differences may be composed: it is the light wherein we must walke: the food of our souls: an antidote that expels any infection: the onely sword that kills the enemy: the onely plaster that can cure our wounds: and the onely documents that can be given towards the attainment of everlasting salvation.

The Marquesses reply to the Kings Paper.

May it please your most excellent Majesty.

Your Majesty is pleased to wave all the marks of the true Church; and to make recourse unto the Scriptures.

I humbly take leave to aske your Majesty what heretique that ever was did not doe so? How shall the greatest heretique in the world, be confuted or censured; if any man may be permitted to appeale to Scriptures: margind with
his

his own notes, send'd with his owne meaning, and enlivened with his owne private spirit? to what end were those marks so fully, both by the Prophets, the Apostles, and our Saviour himselfe set downe, if we make no use of them? To what use are land-marks set up, if Marriners will not believe them to be such?

Yet notwithstanding after that I have said, what I have to say in removall of certain obstacles that lie in the way, I shall lead your Majesty to my Church, through the full body of the Scriptures, or not at all, and then I shall leave it to your royall heart to judge (when you shall see that we have Scripture on our side) whether or no the interpretation thereof be likelier to be true, that hath been adjudged so by Councils, renowned Fathers, famous for sanctity and holinesse of life; continued for the space of a thousand or twelve hundred years, by your owne confession, universally acknowledged; or that such a one as Luther (his word shall be taken, either without Scripture, or against it, with sic volo, and sic jubeo; a man who confessed himselfe, that he received his doctrine from the Devil; or such a one as Calvin and their associates, notoriously infamous in their lives and conversations, plain Rebels to their Moses and Aaron, united to the same person) should counter-balance all the worthies, determinations of Councils, and the continued practice, which so many ages produced.

If your Majestie meanes by the Church all the professors of the Gospel; all that are Christians, are so the true Church; then we are so in your owne sense, and you in ours: then none who believe in the blessed Trinity, the Articles of the Creed; none, who deny the Scriptures to be the word of God, let them construe them as they please, can be hereticall, or of a wrong Religion; therefore we must contradicting with them thus: and by the Protestant Church

and Religion, we must understand those opinions which the Protestants hold contrary to the Church of Rome; and by the Romane, the opinions which they hold dissenting from the Protestant; and then we will see whether we have Scripture for our Religion or not; and whether you have Scripture for what you maintaine; and whose opinions are most approved of by the Primitive times, and Fathers; and what ground your late Divines have built their new opinions upon; and then I shall give you Majestie an answer to the objection which you make against our Church: viz. That she hath forsaken her first love, and fallen from the principles which she held, when she converted us to Christianity.

But first to the removall of these rubs in our way; and then I shall shew as much reverence to the Scripture as any Protestant in the world; and shall endeavour to shew your Majesty that the Scriptures are the Basis or foundation upon which our Church is built.

Your Majesty was pleased to urge the errors of certaine Fathers, to the prejudice of their authority; which I conceive would have been so, had they been all Montanists, Rebaptists, all Anthropomorphists, and all of them generally guilty of the faults, wherewith they were severally charged in the particulars: seeing that when we produce a Father, we doe not intend to produce a man in whose mouth was never found guile: the infallibility being never attributed by us, otherwise then unto the Church, not unto particular Church-men: as Your Majesty hath most excellently observed, in the failings of the holy Apostles, who erred after they had received the holy Ghost, in so ample manner: but when they were all gathered together in Councell, and could send about their edicts, with these capitall letters in the front, *Visum est spiritui sancto & nobis*, Acts 15. 28. then

then I hope your Majesty cannot say, that it was possible for them to erre.

So, though the Fathers might erre in particulars, yet those particular errors would be swallowed up in a generall Councel, and be no more considerable in respect of the whole, then so many heat-drops of error, can stand in competition with a cloud of witnesses, to the divine truth; and be no more prejudicall to their generall determinations, then so many exceptions, are prejudicall to a generall rule. Neither is a particular defection in any man any exception against his testimony, except it be in the thing wherein he is deficient; for otherwise we should be of the nature of the flies, who onely prey upon corruption, leaving all the rest of the body that is whole unregarded.

Secondly, Your Majesty taxes generall Councels for committing errors. If Your Majesty would be pleased to search into the times wherein those Councels were called, Your Majesty shall find, that the Church was then under persecution, and how that Arrian Emperours, rather made Assemblies of Divines, then called any Generall Councels; and if we should suppose them to be generall and free Councels, yet they could not be erroneous in any particular mans judgement, untill a like generall Councell should have concluded the former to be erroneous; (except you will allow particulars to condemn generalls, and private men the whole Church) all generall Councels, from the first unto the last that ever were, or shall be, makes but one Church: and though in their intervals, there be no session of persons, yet there is perpetuall virtue in their decretals, to which every man ought to appeale for judgement, in point of controversy. Now as it is a maxim in our law, Nullum tempus occurrit regi: so it is a maxim in divinity, Nullum tempus occurrit deo: Ubi deus est, as he promised, I will

will be with you alwaies unto the end of the world; that is with his Church, in directing her chief Officers, in all their consultations, relating either to the truth of her doctrine, or the manner of her discipline: wherefore if it should be granted, that the Church had at any time determined amisse; the Church cannot be said to have erred, because you must not take the particular time for the Catholick Church; because the Church is as well Catholick for time as territory; except that you will make rectification an error.

For as in civil affairs, if that we should take advantage of the Parliaments nulling former acts; and thereupon conclude, that we will be no more regulated by its lawes; we should breed confusion in the Common-wealth; for as they alter their laws, upon experience of present inconveniences; so the Councils change their decrees according to that further knowledge which the holy writ assures us, shall encrease in the latter daies; provided that this knowledge be improved by means approved of, and not by every enthusiastick, that shall oppose himselfe against the whole Church.

If I recall my own words, it is no error, but an avoidance of error: so where the same power rectifies it selfe, though some things formerly have been decreed amisse, yet that cannot render the decrees of generall Councils not binding, or incident to error, quoad ad nos; though in themselves, and pro tempore, they may be so.

As to Your Majesties objecting the errors of the holy Apostles, and pen-men of the holy Ghost; and Your inference thereupon, viz. That truth is no where to be found but in holy Scripture, under Your Majesties correction, I take this to be the greatest argument against the private spirit (urged by your Majesty) its leading us into all truth, that
could

could possibly be found out. For if such men (as they) indued with the holy Ghost, inabled with the power of working miracles; so sanctified in their callings, and enlightened in their understandings could erre: how can any man (lesse qualified) assume to himselfe a freedome from not erring, by the assistance of a private spirit?

Lastly, as to Your Majesties quotations of so many Fathers, for the Scriptures easinesse and plainnesse to be understood. If the Scriptures themselves doe tell us, that they are hard to be understood, so that the unlearned and unstable wrest them to their owne destruction: 2 Peter 3. 16. and if the Scripture tells us, that the Eunuch could not understand them except some man should guide him: as Acts 8. 13. and if the Scripture tells us, that Christs owne Disciples could not understand them, untill Christ himselfe expounds them unto them, as Luke 24. 25. and if the Scriptures tell us, how the Angel wept much, because no man was able either in heaven or earth to open the Book sealed with seven seals, nor to look upon it: as Apoc. 5. 1. then certainly all these sayings of theirs are either to be set to the errata's that are behind their books, or else we must look out some other meaning of their words, then what Your Majesty hath inferr'd from thence; as thus, they were easie, id est, in aliquibus, but not in omnibus locis; or thus, they were easie as to the attainment of particular salvation, but not as to the generall cognisance of all the divine mystery therein contained, requisite for the Churches understanding, and by her alone, and her consultations and discusments (guided by an extraordinary and promised assistance) onely to be found out; of which as to every ordinary man, this knowledge is not necessary, so hereof he is not capable.

First, we hold the reall presence; you deny it: we say his
I body

body is there : you say there is nothing but bare bread : we have Scripture for it, Mat. 20. 26. Take, eat, this is my body, so Luke 22. 19. This is my body which is given for you.

You say that the bread which we must eat in the Sacrament, is but dead bread ; Christ saith that that bread is living bread : you say how can this man give us his flesh to eat : we say that that was the objection of Jews, and Infidels, (1 John 6. 25.) not of Christians and believers : you say it was spoken figuratively ; we say it was spoken really, re vera, or as we translate it indeed, John 6. 55. But as the Jews did, so doe ye. First, murmur that Christ should be bread, John 6. 41. Secondly, that that bread should be flesh, John 6. 52. And thirdly, that that flesh should be meat indeed, John 6. 55. untill at last you cry out with the unbelievers, this is a hard saying, who can heare it : John 6. 60. had this been but a figure, certainly Christ would have removed the doubt, when he saw them so offended at the reality, John 6. 61. He would not have confirmed his saying, in terminis, with promise of a greater wonder, John 6. 62. you may as well deny his incarnation, his ascension, and ask, how could the man come down from heaven and goe up againe : (if incomprehensibility should be sufficient to occasion such scruples in your breast) and that which is worse then naught, you have made our Saviours conclusion an argument against the premises ; for where our Saviour tels them thus to argue according unto flesh and blood, in these words, the flesh profiteth nothing ; and that if they will be enlivened in their understanding, they must have faith to believe it in these words, it is the Spirit that quickneth, John 6. 63. They pervert our Saviours meaning into a contrary sense, of their owne imagination : viz. the flesh profiteth nothing, that is to say,

say, Christs body is not in the Sacrament: but in the Spirit that quickneth, *that is to say*, we must onely believe that Christ dyed for us, but not that his body is there: as if there were any need of so many inculcations, pressures, offences, mis-believings, of and in a thing that were no more but a bare memoriall of a thing; being a thing nothing more usuall with the Israelites: as the twelve stones which were erected as a sign of the children of Israels passing over Jordan: That when your children shall ask their Fathers what is meant thereby, then ye shall answer them, &c. Josh. 4. *there would not have been so much difficulty in the belief, if there had not been more in the mysterie; there would not have been so much offence taken at a memorandum, nor so much stumbling at a figure.*

The Fathers are of this opinion, Saint Ignat. in Ep. ad Smir, Saint Justin. Apol: 2. ad Antonium: Saint Cyprian Ser. 4. de lapsis. Saint Ambr. lib. 4. de Sacram. Saint Remigius, &c. affirme the flesh of Christ to be in the Sacrament, and the same flesh which the word of God took in the Virgins wombe.

Secondly, We hold that there is in the Church an infallible rule for understanding of Scripture, besides the Scripture it selfe, this you deny: this we have Scripture for, as Rom. 12. 16. we must prophesie according to the rule of faith: we are bid to walke according to this rule: Gal. 6. 16. we must encrease our faith, and preach the Gospel, according to this rule: 1 Cor. 10. 15. this rule of faith, the holy Scriptures call a form of doctrine: Romans 6. 17. a thing made ready to our hands: 2. Cor. 10. 16. that we may not measure our selves by our selves: 2 Cor. 10. 12. the depositions committed to the Churches trust, 1 Tim. 6. 20. for avoiding of prophane and vain babblings and oppositions of sciences, and by this rule of

faith, is not meant the holy Scriptures; for that cannot do it, as the Apostle tells us; whilst there are unstable men who wrest this way and that way, to their owne destruction; but it is the tradition of the Church and her exposition, as it is delivered from hand to hand as most plainly appears, 2. Tim. 2. 2. viz. The things which thou hast heard of us (not received in writing from me or others) among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithfull men, who shall be able to teach it to others also.

Of this opinion are the Fathers; Saint Irenæus 4. chap. 45. Tertul. de præscr. and Vincent. lir. in suo commentario saith, It is very needfull in regard of so many errors proceeding from misinterpretations of Scripture, that the line of prophetick and Apostolick exposition, should be directed according to the rule of Ecclesiasticall and Catholike sense; *and saith Tertullian præscript. advers. heres. chap. 11.* We doe not admit our adversaries to dispute out of Scripture till they can shew who their Ancestors were, and from whom they received the Scriptures: for the ordinary course of Doctrine, requires that the first question should be, from whom, and by whom, and to whom, the form of Christian Religion was delivered; otherwise prescribing against him as a stranger: *for otherwise if a heathen should come by the Bible, as the Eunuch came by the Prophecie of Esay, and have no Philip to interpret it unto him, he would find out a Religion rather according to his owne fancy, then divine verity.*

In matters of faith, Christ bids us to observe and doe whatsoever they bid us who sit in Moses seat, Mat. 22. 2. therefore surely there is something more to be observed then onely Scripture; will you not as well believe what you hear
Christ

Christ say, as what ye hear his Ministers write? you hear Christ when you hear them, as well as you read Christ when you read his word: He that heareth you heareth me: Luke 10. 16.

We say the Scriptures are not easie to be understood; you say they are: we have Scripture for it, as is before manifested at large: the Fathers say as much: Saint Irenæus lib. 2. chap. 47. Origen: contr. Cels: and Saint Ambr. Epist. 44. ad Constant. calleth the Scripture a Sea and depth of prophetical riddles: and Saint Hier. in præfat: comment. in Ephes: and Saint Aug: Epist. 119. chap. 21. saith: The things of holy Scripture which I know not, are more then those that I know: and Saint Denis, Bishop of Corinth, cited by Eusebius, lib. 7. hist. Eccles. 20. saith of the Scriptures, that the matter thereof was far more profound then his wit could reach.

We say that this Church cannot erre: you say it can: we have Scripture for what we say; such Scripture that will tell you that fools cannot erre therein: Esaiab 35. 8. such Scripture as will tell you, if you neglect to hear it, you shall be a heathen and a publican: Mat. 18. 17. such Scripture as will tell you, that this Church shall be unto Christ a glorious Church, a Church that shall be without spot or wrinkle: Ephesians 5. 27. such a Church as shall be enlivened for ever with his Spirit: Isaiab 59. 21. The Fathers affirm the same, Saint Aug: contra Crescon: lib. 1. cap. 3. Saint Cypr: Epist. 55. ad Cornel. num: 3. Saint Irenæus lib. 3. chap. 4. Cum multis aliis.

We say the Church hath been alwaies visible; you deny it: we have the Scripture for it, Mat. 5. 14, 15. The light of the world; a City upon a hill cannot be hid: 2 Cor. 4. 3. Isaiab 22.

The Fathers unanimously affirme the same; Origen:

Hom: 30. in Math: That the Church is full of light even from the East to the West : *Saint* Chrysost: Hom: 4. in 6. of *Isaiah*, That it is easier for the Sun to be extinguished, then the Church to be darkened : *Saint* Aug: tract: in *Joan*: calls them blind, who doe not see so great a mountain : and *Saint* Cyp: de Unitate Ecclesie.

We hold the perpetuall universality of the Church, and that the Church of Rome is such a Church: you deny it: we have Scripture for it, Psal. 2. 8. Rom. 1. 8, the Fathers affirm as much, Saint Cyp: ep. 57. writing to *Cornelius Pope of Rome*, saith, whilst with you there is one mind and one voice, the whole Church is confessed to be the *Roman Church*. *Saint* Aug: de unitate Eccles. chap. 4. saith, who so communicates not with the whole corps of Christendome, certaine it is that they are not in the holy Catholike Church. *Saint* Hier. in Apol. ad *Ruffin*. saith, that it is all one to say the *Roman faith*, and the *Catholick*.

We hold the unity of the Church to be necessary in all points of faith: you deny it: the severall articles of your Protestant Churches deny it: we have Scripture for it, Eph. 4. 5. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptisme. Acts 4. 35. 1 Cor. 1. 10. The Fathers are of that opinion, Saint Aug: cont. ep. Par. 1. 3. chap. 5. *Saint* Cyp. lib. de unitate ecclesie nu. 3. *Saint* Hyl. lib. ad Constantium Augustum.

We hold that every Minister of the Church, especially the supreme Ministers or head thereof, should be in a capacity of fungifying his office in preaching the Gospel, administering the Sacraments, baptizing, marrying, and not otherwise, this we have Scripture for, Heb. No man taketh this honour unto himselfe but he that is called of God, as Aaron was: this you deny: and not onely so, but you so deny it,

as

as that your Church hath maintained and practised it a long time, for a woman to be head or supreme modera-
trix in the Church; when you know that according to the
word of God (in this respect) a woman is not onely forbid
to be the head of the man, but to have a tongue in her head.
1 Tim. 2. 11, 12. 1 Cor. 14. 34. yet so hath this been de-
nied by you, that many have been hang'd, drawn, and quar-
tered, for not acknowledging it: the Fathers are of our
opinion herein, Saint Damascen. ser. 1. Theod. hist. Ec-
cles. lib. 4. chap. 28. Saint Ignat. Epist. ad Philodolph.
Saint Chrysost. Hom. 5. de verbis Isaiae.

We say that Christ gave commission to his Disciples to
forgive sins, you deny it; and say, that God only can for-
give sins: we have Scripture for it, John 20. 23. Whoso-
soever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosoever
sins ye retain, they are retained: and John 20. 21. As
my Father hath sent me, even so send I you: and how
was that? with so great power; as to forgive sinnes:
Mat. 9. 3. 8. where note, that Saint Matthew doth not set
down, how that the people glorified God the Father, who had
given so great power unto God the Son; but that he had
given so great power unto men, loco citato. The Fathers
are of our opinion, S. Aug. tract. 49. in Ioan. Saint Chrys.
de Sacerdotio. l. 3. Saint Ambros. l. 3. de penitentia.
St. Cyril. l. 12. c. 50. saith, it is not absurd to say, That they
should remit sinnes, who have in them the Holy Ghost: and
Saint Basil. l. 5. cont. Eunom. proved the Holy Ghost to be
God, (and so confuted his heresie) because the Holy Ghost
forgave sinnes by the Apostles: and S. Irenaeus, l. 5. c. 13. so
S. Greg. Hom. 6. Evang.

We hold, that we ought to confesse our sinnes unto our
Ghostly Father: this ye deny, saying, that ye ought not to
confesse your sinnes but unto God alone, this we prove out of
Scripture

Scripture: Mat. 3. 5, 6. Then went out Jerusalem, and all Judah, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their finnes: *this confession was no generall confession, but in particular, as appears, Acts 19. 18, 19.* And many that believed, came and confessed, and shewed their deeds.

The Fathers affirm the same; S. Irenæus, l. 1. c. 9. Tert. lib. de Pœnitentia: where he reprehendeth some, who for humane shamefac'dnesse, neglected to goe to confession. Saint Ambr. saie to bear confession: Amb. ex Paulino: S. Clem. Ep. de fratr. Dom. Origen l. 3. Chrys. l. 3. de sacerdot. S. Ambr. orat. in muliere peccatrice, saith, confesse freely to the Priest the hidden sins of thy soul.

We hold, that men may doe works of supererogation, this you deny: This we prove by Scripture, Mat. 19. 12. viz. There be Eunuches which have made themselves Eunuches for the Kingdome of Heaven: he that is able to receive it, let him receive it. This is more then a Commandment, as Saint Aug: observes upon the place, ser. lib. de temp: for of precepts it is not said, keep them, who is able, but keep them absolutely.

The Fathers are of this opinion: Saint Amb: lib. de viduis. Orig: in c. 15. ad Rom. Euseb. 1. demonstrat. c. 8. Saint Chry: hom. 8. de act. pœnit. Saint Greg: Nicen. 15. Moral: c. 5.

We say, we have free-will, you deny it, we prove we have out of Scripture, viz. 1 Cor. 17. He that standeth steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doth well.

Dent. 30. 11. I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing, chuse life, that thou and thy seed may live: And Christ himself said, O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how oft would I have gathered thy children together

gether, as a Hen gathers her Chickens, and ye would not? *where Christ would, and they would not: there might have been a willingnesse as well as a willing, or else Christ had wept in vain; and to think that he did so, were to make him an impostor.*

The ancient Fathers are of our opinion: Euseb: Cæsar: de præp. l. 1. c. 7. Saint Hilde: Trin: Saint Aug: l. 1. ad Simp: q. 4. Saint Ambr: in Luc: c. 12. Saint Chrys: hom: 19. in Gen: Irenæus l. 4. c. 72. S. Cyril: l. 4. in Joan: in c. 7. &c.

We hold it possible to keep the Commandments; you say it is impossible: we have Scripture for it, Luke 1. 6. And they were both righteous before God: walking in all the Commandments and Ordinances of the Lord, blamelesse: and 1 John 5. 3. His Commandments are not grievous.

The Fathers are for us: Orig: Hom: 9. in Josue: Saint Cyril: lib. 4. cont: Julian: Saint Hyl: in Psal. 118. Saint Hier: lib. 3. cont: Pelag: Saint Basil:

We say, faith cannot justifie without works: yee say good works are not absolutely necessary to salvation: we have Scripture for what we say, 1 Cor. 13. 2. Though I have all faith, and have no charity, I am nothing: and James 2. 24. By works a man is justified and not by faith onely.

This opinion of yours Saint Aug: lib. de fide & oper: cap. 14. saith, was an old heresie, in the Apostles time; and in the preface of his Comment: upon the 32. Psal. he calls it the right way to hell and damnation: See Orig: in 5. to the Rom: S. Hillar. chap. 7. in Mat: S. Amb: 4. ad Heb: &c.

We hold, good works to be meritorious; you deny it: we have Scripture for it, Mat. 6. 27. He shall reward every

K

man

man according to his works. *Mat. 5. 12.* Great is your reward in heaven. *Reward at the end, presupposes merit in the worke : the distinction of secundum, and propter opera ; is too nice to make such a division in the Church.*

The Fathers were of our opinion. S. Amb. de Apolog. David. cap. 6. S. Hier. lib. 3. Cont. Pelag. S. Aug. de Spiritu & lit. cap. ult. and divers others.

We hold, that faith once had, may be lost, if we have not care to preserve it : You say it cannot ; we have Scripture for it, viz. Luke 8. 13. They on the rock, ate they, which when they hear, receive the word with joy ; which, for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away. So *1 Tim. 1. 18, 19.* Which some having put away, have made shipwrack of their faith.

This is frequently affirmed amongst the Fathers, see S. Aug. de gratia, & lib. arbit. de correp. & gratia, & ad articulos.

We hold, that God did never inevitably damn any man before he was born : or as you say, from all eternity ; you say, he did : we have Scripture for what we say, Wis. 1. 13. God made not death, neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living. *1 Tim. 2. 34.* God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved. *2 Pet. 3. 9.* The Lord is not willing that any should die, but that all should come to repentance : and if you will not believe, when he sues so, believe him when he swears it : As I live, saith the Lord, I doe not delight in the death of a sinner.

The Fathers are of our opinion, S. Aug. lib. 1. Civit. Dei. Tertul. Orat. cap. 8. Saint Cypr. lib. 4. Epist. 2. and Saint Amb. lib. 2. de Cani & Abel.

We hold, that no man ought, infallibly, to assure himselfe of his salvation : you say he ought, the Scripture saith we ought

ought not, 1 Cor. 9. 27. S. Paul was not assured, but that whilst he preached unto others, he himselfe might become a cast-away.

Rom. 11. 20. Thou standest in the faith: be not high-minded, but fear, &c. least thou also maist be cut off. Phil. 2. 12. Worke out your salvation with fear and trembling.

The Fathers are of our opinion: Amb: Ser. 5. in Psal. 118. S. Basil. in Constil. Monast. chap. 2. S. Hier: lib. 2. Advers. Pelagian: S. Crysof. Hom. 87. in Joan. S. Aug: in Psal. 40. S. Bernard Ser. 3. de Advent. and Ser. 1. de Sept. saith, Who can say I am of the Elect?

We say that every man hath an Angel guardian; you say he hath not; we have Scripture for it, viz. Mat. 18. 10. Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, that in heaven, their Angels doe alwaies behold the face of my Father. Acts 12. 13. S. Peter knocking at the door, they say, it is his Angel; they believed this in the Apostles time: the Fathers believed it along. S. Greg. Dial. lib. 4. cap. 58. S. Athanas. de Communi Essentia. S. Chrys. Hom. 2. in ep. ad Colof. lib. 6. de Sacer. Greg. Turonens. lib. de gloria Martyr. S. Aug. ep. ad Probam cap. 19. and S. Jer. upon these words, Their Angels, Mat 17. 10. calls it a great dignity, which every one hath from his Nativity.

We say, the Angels pray for us, knowing our thoughts, and deeds; you deny it: we have Scripture for it, Zach. 1. 9, 10, 11, 12. Then the Angel of the Lord, answered, and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the Cities of Judah, against whom thou hast had indignation, these threescore and ten years? Apoc. 8. 4. And the smoake of the

incense of the prayers of the Saints, ascended from the hand of the Angel before the Lord.

This place was so understood by Irenæus, lib. 4. cap. 34. and S. Hillary in Psal. 129. tells us, This intercession of Angels, Gods nature needeth not, but our infirmities doe: So S. Amb. lib. de viduis, Victor. utic. lib. 3. de perfectione Vandalorum.

We hold it lawfull to pray unto them; you not: we have Scripture for it, Gen. 48. 16. The Angel which redeemed me from all evill, bleffe these lads, &c. Hosea 12. 4. He had power over the Angel, and prevailed: he wept and made supplications unto them.

Saint Augustine expounding these words of Job 19. 21. Have pittie upon me, O ye my friends, for the hand of the Lord is upon me, saith, that holy Job addressed himselfe to the Angels.

We hold, that the Saints deceased, know what passeth here on earth; you say they know not: we have Scripture for it, Luke 16. 29. where Abraham knew that there were Moses and the Prophets Books here on earth, which he himselfe had never seen when he was alive.

The Fathers say as much, Euseb. Ser. de Ann. S. Hier. in Epit. Paulæ. S. Maxim. Ser. de S. Agnete.

We say, they pray for us; you not: we have Scripture for it, Apoc. 5. 8. The twenty four Elders fell downe before the Lambe, having every one of them Harpes, and golden Viols, full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints. Baruch 3. 4. O Lord Almighty, thou God of Israel, hear now the prayers of the dead Israelites.

The Fathers were of this opinion, S. Aug. Ser. 15. de verbis Apost. S. Hilar. in Psal. 129. S. Damasc. lib. 4. de fide cap. 16.

We

We hold that we may pray to them; you not: we have Scripture for it, Luke 16. 24. Father Abraham have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, &c. You bid us shew one proof, for the lawfulness hereof, when here are two Saints pray'd unto in one verse: and though Dives were in Hell, yet Abraham in Heaven would not have expostulated with him so much, without a non-nobis Domine, if it had been in it selfe, a thing not lawfull: You will say it is a parable; yet a jury of ten Fathers, of the grand inquest, as Theophil. Tertul. Clem. Alex. S. Chrys. S. Jer. S. Amb. S. Aug. S. Greg. Euthem. and Ven. Beda, give their verdict, that it was a true History: but suppose it were a parable; yet every parable is either true in the persons named, or else may be true in some others: The Holy Ghost tells no lies, nor fables, nor speaks not to us in parables, consisting either of impossibilities, or things improbable, Job 5. 1. Call now, if there be any that will answer thee, and to which of the Saints wilt thou turne? It had been a frivolous thing in Eliphaz, to have asked Job the question; if invocation of Saints had not been the practise of that time.

The Fathers affirme the same, S. Diony. c. 7. S. Athan. Ser. de Anunt. S. Basil. Orat. 44. in Mat. S. Chrys. Hom. 66. ad Popul. S. Hier. pray'd to S. Paula in Epitaph. S. Paulæ. S. Maximus to S. Agnes, Ser. de S. Agnete. S. Bern. to our blessed Lady.

We hold Confirmation necessary; you not: we have Scripture for it, Acts 8. 14. Peter and John prayed for them, that they might receive the holy Ghost (for as yet he was fallen upon none of them; onely they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus) Then laid they their hands on them; and they received the holy Ghost: Where we see the holy Ghost was given in Confir-

mation, which was not given in Baptisme: also Heb. 6. 1. Therefore leaying the principles of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection, not laying againe the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith, towards God, of Baptisme, and of Laying on of hands.

The Fathers affirme the same. Tert. lib. de Resurrect. Carn. S. Pacian. lib. de Bapt. S. Amb. lib. de Sac. S. Hier. Cont. Lucif. S. Cypr. lib. 2. Ep. 1. speaking both of Baptisme, and Confirmation, saith, Then they may be sanctified and be the sons of God, if they be borne in both Sacraments.

We hold it sufficient to communicate in one kind; you not: we have Scripture for it, John 6. 15. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. If everlasting life be sufficient, then is it also sufficient to communicate under one kind: So Acts 2. 42. And they continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, and fellowship (or communion) and in breaking of bread and prayer: where is no mention of the cup, and yet they remained stedfast in the Apostles doctrine, Luke 24. 30. 8. 35. where Christ communicated his two Disciples under one kind.

Saint Augustine and Theophylact, lib. de Consens. Evang. cap. 25. expound this place of the blessed Sacrament, S. Chrys. Hom. 17. oper. imperfecti.

We hold, that Christ offered up unto his Father, in the Sacrifice of the Masse (as an expiation for the sins of the people) is a true and proper Sacrifice; this you deny: this we prove by Scripture, viz. Malach. 1. 11. From the rising of the Sun, unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles: and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering: This could not be meant of the figurative offerings

rings of the Jewes, because it was spoken of the Gentiles; neither can it be understood, of the reall Sacrifice of Christ upon the Crosse; because that was done but in one place, and at one time, and then, and there, not among the Gentiles neither: which could be no other, but the daily Sacrifice of the Masse; which is, and ever was, from East to West, a pure and daily Sacrifice, Luke 22. 19. This is my body, which is given for you: not to you; therefore a Sacrifice.

The Fathers are of this opinion: S. Clem. Apost. Const. lib. 6. cap. 23. who calleth it a reasonable, unbloudy, and Mysticall Sacrament, S. Aug. lib. 1. Cont. advers. leg. & proph. cap. 18. 19. calleth it a singular, and most excellent Sacrifice. S. Chrys. Hom. in Psal. 95. calleth it a pure and unbloudy host, a heavenly, and most reverend Sacrifice. S. Greg. Nicen. Orat. 4. de Resurrect.

We say that the Sacrament of Orders, confers grace upon those, on whom the hands of the Presbytery are imposed; you both deny it to be a Sacrament, notwithstanding the holy Ghost is given unto them thereby; and also you deny, that it confers any inferiour grace at all upon them: we have Scripture for what we hold, viz. 1 Tim. 4. 14. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, and with the laying on the hands of the Presbytery, So 1 Tim. 1. 6. Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on my hands.

S. Aug. lib. 4. Quæst. super Num. S. Cyp. Ep. ad Magnum. Opratus Milevit. the place beginneth, ne quis miretur. Tertul. in prescript. The place beginneth Edant Origines.

We hold, that the Priest, and other Religious persons who have vowed chastity to God, may not Marry afterwards; you deny, first, that it is lawfull to make any such vows:
and

and secondly, That those who have made any such vowes, are not bound to keep them; we have Scripture for what we hold, Deuteronomie 23. 22. When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it: for the Lord thy God will require it of thee. So 1 Tim. 5. 11, 12. But the younger widows refuse, for when they have begun to wax wanton, against the Lord, they will marry, having damnation; because they have cast off their first faith. *What can be meant hereby, but the vow of Chastity? or by their first faith, but some promise made to Christ, in that behalfe? otherwise, Marriage could not be damnable: so all the antient Fathers have expounded it. Saint Aug. lib. de bona viduit. cap. 9. Saint Athanas. lib. de Virginitat. Saint Epiph: Heres. 48. Saint Hier. cont. Jovin. lib. cap. 7.*

We say, Christ descended into Hell, and delivered thence the Soules of the Fathers; ye deny it: we have Scripture for it, viz. Ephes. 4. 8. When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, &c. Descending first, into the lower part of the Earth. This lower part of the Earth, could not be a Grave; for that was the upper part: nor could it have been the place of the damned; for the Devils would have been brought againe into heaven: more clearly, Acts 2. 27. Thou wilt not leave my soule in Hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption: there is hell for his soule for a time; and the grave for his body, for a while: plainer yet, 1 Pet. 3. 18, 19. Being put to death in the flesh, but quickned by the Spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison: this prison cannot be heaven, nor hell, as it is the place of the damned; nor the grave, as it is the place of rest; therefore it must be (as Saint Aug. Epist. 99. ad Evod. saith) some third place; which third place, the Fathers have

have called Limbus patrum: also Zachary 9. 11. As for thee also, by the bloud of thy Covenant, I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is water: by this pit, could not be meant the place of the damned; for they have no share in the Covenant; neither are they Christs prisoners, but the devils; neither could this pit be the grave; because Christs grave was a new pit, where never any was laid before.

The Fathers affirme as much; Saint Hier. in 4. ad Ephes. Saint Greg. lib. 13. Moral. cap. 20. Saint Aug. in Psal. 3. 7. ver. 1.

We hold purgatory fire, where satisfaction shall be made for sinnes after death; you deny it: we have Scripture for it, 1 Cor. 3. 13. 15. The fire shall try every mans work of what sort it is, if any mans work shall be burnt he shall suffer losse; but he himselve shall be saved, yet so as by fire. *

Lastly, We hold extreme Unction to be a Sacrament; you neither hold it to be a Sacrament, neither doe you practise it, as a duty: we have Scripture for it, James 5. 13. Is any sick among you? let him call the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oyle, in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick: and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him: Neither any, nor all the Sacraments, were or could be more effectual, mens good, nor more substantiall in matter; nor more exquisite in forme; nor more punctuall in designation of its ministry: other Sacraments being bounded within the limits of the soules onely good; this extends it selfe to the good both of soule and body: he shall recover from his sicknesse, and his sins shall be forgiven him: and yet it is both left out in your practise, and acknowledgment.

L

The

* Saint Aug. so interprets this place upon the 37. Psal. also S. Amb. upon 1 Cor. 3. and Ser. 20. in Psal. 118. S. Hier. l. 2. cap. 13. ad ver. Joan. S. Greg. lib. 4. dialog. c. 39. Orig. hom. 9. in c. 15. Exod.

The Fathers are on our side, Orig. Hom. 2. in Levit. S. Chrys. lib. 3. de Sacerd. S. Aug. in speculo & Ser. 215. de temp. Vener. Bed. in 6. Marke, and S. James, and many others.

Thus most Sacred S I R, we have no reason to wave the Scriptures umpirage; so that you will bear it speak in the mother language, and not produce it, as a witnesse on your side, when the producers tell us nothing, but their owne meaning, in a language unknowne to all the former ages, and then tell us, that she saith so, and they will have it so; because, he that hath a Bible and a sword, shall carry away the meaning from him that hath a Bible, and we're a sword: nor is it more blasphemy, to say, that the Scripture is the Churches off-spring, because it is the word of God, then it is for me to say, I am the sonne of such a man, because God made me instrumentally; I am so, and so was shee; for as saith Saint Aug: Evangelio non crederum, nisi me Ecclesiae anthoritas commoveret. I should not believe the Gospel it selfe, unlesse I were moved by the authority of the Church. There was a Church, before there was a Scripture, take which Testament you please.

*We grant you, that the Scripture is the Originall of all light: yet we see light, before we see the Sun; and we know there was a light, when there was no Sun: the one is but the body of the other. We grant you the Scriptures to be the Celestiall globe, but we must not grant you that every one knows how to use it; or that it is necessary or possible they should. We grant that the Scripture is a light to our feet, and a lanthorne to our paths: then you must grant me that it is requisite that we have a guide, or else we may lose our way in the light, as well as in the darke. We grant you that it is the food of our souls, yet there must be some body that must divide, or break the bread. We grant you that it is the
only*

only antidote against the infection of the Devil, yet it is not every ones profession to be a compounder of the ingredients. We grant your Majesty the Scripture to be the only sword and buckler to defend a Church from her Ghostly enemies: yet I hope you will not have the glorious company of the Apostles, and the goodly fellow ship of the Prophets to exclude the noble Army of Martyrs, and the holy Church, which through all the world doth acknowledge Christ; wherefore having shewne Your Majestie how much the Scriptures are ours: I shall now consider your opinions apart from us, and see how they are yours; and who sides with You, in Your opinion, besides Your selves: and first, I shall crave the boldnesse to begin with the Protestants of the Church of England.

The Church of England.

WHose Religion, as it is in opposition to ours, consists also together in denying (for what she affirms, we affirme the same) as the Reall presence; the infallibility, wisdom, universality, and unity of the Church; confession and remission of sins; free-will, and possibility of keeping the Commandments, &c. All these things you deny, and you may as well deny the blessed Trinity (for we have no such word in Scripture, onely inference) then that which ye have already denied; and for which we have plaine Scripture, Fathers, Councils, practise of the Church: that which ye hold positive in your Discipline, is more erroneous, then that which is negative in your Doctrine: as your maintaining a woman to be head, Supream, or Moderatrix in the Church, who by the Apostles rule is not to speak in the Church (or that a Lay-man may be so) what Scripture, or

Fathers, or custome have ye for this? or that a Lay-man (as your Lay-Chancellour) should excommunicate and deliver up soules to Sathan? Whereas matters of so weighty concernment, as delivering of mens soules into the Devils hands should not be executed, and upon mature deliberation, and immergent occasions, and not by any, but those who have the undoubted Authority; lest otherwise, you make the Authority it selfe to be doubted of. A strange Religion; whose Ministers are denyed the power of remitting sins; whilst Lay-men are admitted to the power of retaining them: and that upon every ordinary occasion, as non-payment of fees, and the like: Whereas such practises as these have rendred the rod of Aaron, no more formidable then a reed shaken with the wind; so that you have brought it to this, that whilst such men as these were permitted to excommunicate for a threepeny matter, the people made not a threepeny matter of their Excommunication.

The Church of Saxony.

*Ad Argent.
An. 1525.*

NOW for the Church of Saxony, you shall find Luther, a man not only obtruding new Doctrine upon his Disciples, without Scripture, or contrary to Scripture; but also Doctrine denying Scripture, to be Scripture, and wilpend- ing those books of Scripture, which were received into the Canon, and acknowledged to be the word of God, in all ages. As,

*Luther anvi-
val. tit. de lib.
novi & ver.
testam. Reben-
stock, lib. 2.
Colloq. lxx.
Luth. c. de vet.
test.*

The book of Eccles. saying, That it hath never a perfect sentence in it, and that the Author thereof had neither boots nor spurs, but rid upon a long stick, or begging shooes, as he did when he was a Fryar. c

And the book of Job, that the argument thereof, is a meer

meer fiction; invented onely, for the setting downe of a true and lively example of patience. *d*

That it is a false opinion, and to be abolished, that there are four Gospels; and that the Gospel of *S. John* is only true. *e*

That the Epistle of *S. James* is contentious, swelling, dry, strawy, and unworthy an Apostolical spirit. *f*

And that Moses in his writings, shewes unpleasant, stopped and angry lips; in which the word of grace is not, but of wrath, death and sin. *g*

He calls him a Goaler, Executioner, and a cruell Serjeant. *h*

For his doctrine: *He holds*, a threefold Divinity: or thye kinds; as there are three persons *whereupon* Zwinglius *taxes him* for maning three Gods, or three Natures in the Divinity. *i*

He himselfe is angry with the word Trinity, calling it a humane invention, and a thing that soundeth very coldly. *k*

He justifies the Arrians, and saith, they did very well in expelling the word (*Homousion*) being a word that his soule hated. *l*

He affirmed that Christ was from all eternity, even according to his humane nature: *taxed for it by* Zwing. *in these words*, how can Christ then be said to be borne of a woman? *m*

He affirms that, as Christ dyed with great pain, so he seems to have sustained pains in Hell after death. *n*

That the divinity of Christ suffered, or else he were none of his Christ. *o*

That if the humane nature should only suffer for him, that Christ were but a Saviour of a vile account, and had need himselfe of another Saviour. *p*

d Luth. Ser. convinal. tit. ut supra. & tit. de Patrick. & Prophet.

e Luth. præfat. in nov. test. & lib. de descript. & Eccles. auth. c. 3.

f Luth. præf. in Epist. Tac. edit. Jenens.

g Luth. Tom. 3. Wit. fol. 422.

h Fol. 421. 422.

i Zwingl. part. 2. fol. 474.

k Luth. postill. majore Basil apud Harv. g. enarr. Evang. dom. Trinit.

l Luth. l. cont. latom. tom. wit. imp. an. 1551.

m Zwingl. Part. 2. fol. 402.

n Luth. tom. 3. fol. 219.

o Luth. lib. de Concil. part. 2. & Hosp.

Hist. Sac. part. 2 fol. 76.

p Luth. Confes. ma. de cæna. tom. 3. ten. fol. 454.

Luther held not onely consubstantiation, but also (saith Hospinian) that the body and bloud of Christ both is, and may be found, according to the substance, not only in the bread and wine of the Eucharist: or in the hearts of the faithfull, but also in all Creatures, in fire, water, or in the rope and halter wherewith desperate persons hang themselves. q

q Hospin. v.
61. supra. fol.
44. Luth. ser. de
Mose.

r See epist. ad
Galat. c. 4. &
c. 20. Exod.

s Covell. def.
of M. Hooker.
pag. 42.

t Luth. tom.
5. fol. 442.

u Luth. praef.
in Alex. lib. de
Ecclef.

w Luth. tom.
2. fol. 103.

x Ibid. fol.
73.

y Ibid. fol.
367.

z Hosp. Hist.
Sac. part 2. fol.
14. Covell. def.
of Hooker, pag.
101.

a Luth. tom.
6. Ger. de ex-
cul. potest.

He averreth, that the Ten Commandments belong not unto us, for God did not lead us, but the Jewes forth of Egypt. r

That faith, except it be without (even the least) good works, doth not justifie, and is no faith: Whereof you may see him condemned and cited by s

That we are equall in dignity and honour with Saint Paul, Saint Peter, or the blessed Virgin Mary, or all the Saints. t

That all the holinesse which they have used in fasting, and prayer, enduring labours, chastising their bodies, austerity and hardnesse of life, may be daily performed by a hog or a dog. u

That in absence of a Priest, a woman or a boy, or any Christian may absolve. w

That they onely communicate worthily, who have confused and erroneous consciences. x

That a Priest, especially in the new Testament, is not made, but borne; not consecrated, but created. y

That the Sacrament were true, though it were administered by the Devil: See him baited for it by two of his fellow Protestants. z

That among Christians no man can, or ought to be a Magistrate; but each one is to other equally subject: and that among Christian men, none is superiour save one, and only Christ: (a) That the husband, in case
the

the wife refuse his bed; may say unto her, if thou wilt not, another will; if the Mistresse will not, let the maid come. (b) That the Magistrates duty is to put such a wife to death; and that if that the Magistrate omit to doe so, the husband may imagine that his wife is stolne away by theeves, and flaine, and consider how to marry another. c

That the adulterer may flie into another Country; and if he cannot contain, marry againe. d

That Polygamy is no more abrogated then the rest of Moses Law; and that it is free, as being neither commanded, nor forbidden. e

That it is no more in his power to be without a woman, then it is in his power to be no man: and that it is more necessary then to eat, drink, purge, or blow his nose. f

I will give you the latine of another opinion of his, because they are his owne words; but not any of my english shall be accessary to the transportation of such a blast into my native language: Perinde faciunt qui continenter vivere instituunt, acsi qui excrementa vel lotium contra naturæ impetum retinere velit: (g) Luther saith, How can man prepare himselfe to good? seeing it is not in his power to make his waies evill; for God worketh the wicked work in the wicked. h

But I pray you where have you this, or any of all this in Scripture, nay what Scripture have you for it? that Scripture should be no Scripture, as hitherto he hath made a great part of it; and Zwingl. almost all the rest, denying all Pauls Epist: to be sacred: Zwingl. tom. 2. fol. 10. What Councel, what Fathers, what primitive, or sequent Church (Ulsq; ad) ever taught or approved such doctrine as this? and how are we cryed out upon for errors, notwithstanding we

b Luth. tom. 5. fol. 123.

c Ibid. fol. 123. See also 111.

d Luth. Ibid. fol. 123.

e Luth. propos. de Bigam. Epist. An. 1528. propos. 62. 65, 66. See in c. 16. Gen. edit. An. 525.

f Luth. tom. 5. fol. 119.

g Luth. in suo glossen. in decret. Noreberg.

h Luth. tom. 2. Wiff. An. 1551. assert. art. 36, also de servo. arbit. edit. 1603. fol. 195.

i Luth. Ep.
ad Argent. An.
1525.

k Epist. ad
Anonymum.
tom. 5.

l Luth. tom.
5. Germ. fol.
from 141. to
144.

m Luth. ad-
vers. falso no-
min. Eccles.
stat. prepe init.

we have all for our Justification? and yet this is the man that boasted, that Christ was first published by him; (i) and by all of you that he was the first reformer: this is he who calls himselfe a more excellent Doctor then all those who are in the papacy. k

This is he who thus brags of himselfe, viz. Dr. Martin Luther will have it so, a Papist and an Asse are directly the same; so is my will, such is my command; my will is my reason. l

This is he that tells you, I will have you to know, that I will not (hereafter) vouchsafe you the honour, as that I will suffer either you, or the very Angels of heaven, to judge of my doctrine, &c. Nor will I have my doctrine judged by any, no not by the Angels themselves: for I being certaine thereof, will (by it) be judge both of you and the Angels. m

And lastly, this is he that gave the alarme to all Christendome, of the errors, idolatries, superstitions and prophane-nesse of the Church of Rome: but what Scriptures have you for it, that you should not believe the Scriptures? what Fathers have you, that you should not believe the Church? what custome have you, that you should not believe the Fathers, rather then any private interpretation? the promised holy Ghost, alwaies ruling in the Church, rather then the presumed private Spirit in any particular man.

The Church of Geneva.

NOW for the Church of Geneva: Calvin comming after him, is not contented to stop himselfe at Luthers bounds; but he goes further, and detraicts not onely from the Scripture, but from Christ and God himselfe. For first, He

He maintaines, that three essences doe arise out of the holy Trinity. a

That the Sonne hath his substance distinct from the Father; and that he is a distinct God, from the Father. b

He teacheth that the Father can neither wholly, nor by parts, communicate his nature to Christ; but must withall be deprived thereof himselfe. c

He denies that the Sonne is begotten of the Fathers substance and essence; affirming that he is God of himselfe, not God of God: (d) He saies, that that dream of the absolute power of God, which the Schoolmen have brought in, is execrable blasphemy. e

He saith, that where it is said, that the Father is greater then I, it hath been restrained to the humane nature of Christ; but I doe not doubt to extend it to him as God and man. f

He severeth the person of the Mediator from Christs divine person; maintaining with Nestorius two persons in Christ, the one humane, and the other divine. g

That Christs soule was subject to ignorance; and that this was the onely difference betwixt us, and him: that our infirmities are of necessity, and this was voluntary. h

That it is evident that ignorance was common to Christ, with the Angels. i

And particulariseth wherein, viz. that he knew not the day of Judgement; (k) Nor that the Fig-tree was barren which he cursed, till he came near it. l

He is not afraid to censure, certaine words of Christ to be but a weak confutation, of what he sought to refute. (m) And saies, Christ seems here not to reason solidly. n

He tells us that this similitude of Christ seemes to be

M

harsh,

a Tract. theol. p. 793.

b A&S. Serv. p. 249, 250, 871, 872.

c Tract. theol. p. 771, 772.

d 1 Instit. c. 13. Sect. 23. 29.

e Calv. ad c. 23. Ezech. gal. script. also Instit. l. 3. c. 23. Sect. 2.

f Tract. theol. p. 794. see p. 792. & 2. Instit. cap. 14. Sect. 3. and cap. 17. Jo. v. 12. and c. 22. Math.

g Lib. 1. Instit. cap. 13. Sect. 9. 23, 24.

h In cap. 2. Luke v. 40.

i In cap. 24. Mat. v. 36.

k In cap. 24. Mat. v. 36.

l In c. 21. Mat. ver. 19.

m also ib. c. 9. v. 2. In c. 12.

n Mat. v. 25.

Id. in c. 9. Mat. v. 5.

harsh, and farre fetch'd, and (a little after) the similitude of sitting doth not hang together. *o*

Where Christ inferred All things, therefore whatsoever you will, &c. Calvin *giveth it this glosse*: It is a superfluous or vaine illation. *p*

This Metaphor of Christ is somewhat harsh: (*q*) *He saith*, inasmuch as Christ should promise from God a reward to fasting, it was an improper speech. *r*

He writeth of a saying of Christ, that it seemes to be spoken improperly, and absurdly, in French *sans raison*. *s*

He saith, that Christ refused, and denyed, as much as lay in him, to performe the office of a Mediator. *t*

That he manifested his owne effeminatenesse, by his shunning of death. *u*

He saith, that Theeves, and malefactors, hasten to death with obstinate resolution; despising it with haughty courage, others mildly suffer it: but what constancy, stoutnesse, or courage was there in the Son of God, who was astonished, and in a manner, stricken dead with fear of death: how shamefull a tenderesse was it, to be so far tormented with fear of common death, as to melt in bloody sweat, and not to be able to be comforted but by the sight of Angels? *w*

And that the same vehemency took him from the present memory of the heavenly decree; so that he forgot at that instant, that he was sent hither to be our redeemer. *x*

This prayer of Christ was not premeditate: but the force, and extremity of grief, wringed from him this hasty speech; to which a correction was presently added, *and a little before*, he chastiseth, and recalleth that vow of his, which he had let suddainly slip. *b*

Thus,

o Calvin. in c.
16. & 22.
Luke.

p In c. 7.
Mat. v. 12.
q In c. 9. Mat.
v. 49.

r In Mat. c. 9.
v. 16, 17, 18.

s In c. 3.
Joan. v. 21.

t In c. 26.
Mat. v. 39.

u Cap. 12. Jo.
v. 27.

w Lib. 2. Instit.
c. 16. Sec. 22.

x In c. 26.
Mat. v. 39.

b Id. 16.

Thus doe we see Christ to be on all sides so vexed, as being over-whelmed with desperation, he ceased to call upon God : which was as much as to renounce his salvation, and this (*saieth he*) a little before, was not fained, or as a thing only acted upon a stage. *e*

That Christ in his soul suffered the terrible torments of a damned and forsaken man. *d*

In the death of Christ occurs a spectacle full of desperation. *e*

In this spectacle there was nothing but matter of ex-treame despair. *f*

It is no marvell if it be said that Christ went downe into Hell, since he suffered that death wherewith God in wrath striketh wicked doers. *g*

That Christ sitting at the right hand of his Father, holds but a second degree with him in honour, and rule, and is but his Vicar. *h*

Lastly, Calvin holds it to be absurd, that Christ should challenge to himselfe, the glory of his owne resurrection; when the Scripture, *saieth he*, every where teacheth it to be the work of God the Father. *i*

That God is the Author of all those things, which these Popish Judges would have to happen onely by his idle sufferance, *Instit. lib. cap. 18. Sect. 3.*

That our sins are not onely by his commission, but decree, and will: 16. Sect. 1, 2. & lib. 2. cap. 4. Sect. 3, 4. Which blasphemy is condemned by his famous brethren: Fleming. lib. de univers. grat. p. 109. Osiander Euchir. Controvers. p. 104. Schaffm. de peccat. causis. p. 155. 27. Sirzlinus disput. Theol. de providentia Dei, Sect. 141. *Insomuch that the Magistrates of Berne, made it penall by their Laws, for any man to preach, or read any of his books or doctrine: Vide literas Senat. Bern. ad ministros, An. 1555.*

e In c. 27.
Mar. v. 46, 47.

d Lib. 2. Instit.
c. 16. Sect. 10.

e In c. 27.
Mar. v. 57.

f In c. 14.
Joan. v. 6.

g Lib. 2. In-
stit. c. 6. Sect.
10.

h In c. 26.
Mar. v. 64.

i In. c. 2.
Joan. also in
c. 8. ad Rom.

This man strikes neither at the right hand, nor on the left, but at the King of Israel himselfe, who can thinke this mans mouth any slander, or his invectiōs, a depravement, when he belches forth such blasphemies against the Son of God, in whom the fulnesse of the God-head dwelt bodily? or who could thinke this man fit to reforme a Church, when nothing more required reformation then his owne errorrs? But what Scriptures or Fathers is there for all this?

k Zwingl.
tom. 2. fol.

249.

l Andr. confut. Grina. p. 128. 254. 304. Schlus. Theol. Calv. 6. 1. in Proæm.

m In tom. 7. wit. fol. 228. and tom. 6. Germ. tenen. fol. 28. Calv. theol. l. 2.

A&C. 1. Zwingl. tom. 2. fol. 210.

o Zwingl. tom. 1. 137.

p Zwingl. tom. 2. fol. 90.

See fol. 89. 115, 116. and

in Epist. Oecol. & Zwingl.

l. 1. p. 252, 258.

q Tom 2. fol. 96.

r Tom. 1 fol. 84, 85. &

lib. 4. Epist. Zwingl. & Oecol. p. 868, 869,

The Doctrine of the Zwinglians.

ZWinglius confesseth himselfe to have been instructed against the Masse, by a certaine admonisher, which he knew not, whether it was black or white. k

The same derided, as illusion by the learned Protestants. l

The same as Luther's Devil, largely set downe by himselfe. m

He is taxed by Calvin for depraving the Scripture, for changing the word est, and putting in significat in his Translation of the New Testament: He saies, that these sayings, and the like, viz. If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments, &c. are but superfluous and hyperbolically. o

He denies, that Originall sin can damne us; calling it but a disease or contagion. p

He maketh Baptizing of Infants, a thing indifferent; which may be used or left off. q

That Princes may be deposed by the godly, if they be wicked, or goe contrary to the rule of Christ. r

He saith, that when we commit adultery, or murder, it

it is the work of God: being the mover, the Author, or inciter, &c. God moveth the thiefe to kill, &c. he is forced to sin, &c. God hardned *Pharaoh*, not speaking hyperbolically, but he truly hardned him, though he had resisted: s

For which he is particularly reprehended by the learned Protestant, Grawerus. (t) But where is there any Scripture, or Fathers or Doctors of the Church, that ever taught this Doctrine before?

s Zwing. to. 10.
de provid. Dei,
fo: 365, 366,
367.
t Absurda: Ab-
surd: c. 5. de
prædest. fo: 3, 4

Melancthons Doctrine.

For Melancthon *he taught that there are three Divinities, as there are three Persons. u*

For which he is reprehended by Stancarus. w

He affirms polygamy, not to be against Jus Divinum: and adviseth Hen. 8. unto it. x

He teacheth peremptory resistance against Magistrates. y

He inableth the inferiour Magistrate, to alter Religion against the contrary Edicts of the Superiour. z

So Calvin, so Beza, so Goodman, so Danæus, so Knox, so Buch: so Bancroft, so Fenners, so Scutcliff, so Hotto-manus, so Ficlerus, so Renekerus, all hold it lawfull, to depose, murder, or to arraigne their Prince. Call in forraigne ayd to assist them. Bestow the Crown at their pleasure. Destroy them, either by peaceable practices, or open War. Propose rewards to such: but where have they Scriptures, or Fathers, or times, that shewed the practise of such doings, before these latter times, and latter practices?

u Melanct. loc.
com. An. 1545.
c. de Christo.
w l. 4. de Trin.
x Melanct. Con-
cil. Theol. pag.
134.
y Ep. ad Rom.
cap. 13.
z Con. Theol.
part 1. p. 314.

The Doctrine of *Andreas Musculus*.

AS for *Andreas Musculus*, he was not afraid openly to teach, that the Divine Nature of Christ, (which is God) died upon the crosse with his humane Nature. Neither did he desist (publickly) to professe and spread abroad this Doctrine of the death of Christs Divinity. And that by the help of *Johannes Isebius*. Thus far. c

It is manifest, (saith *Simlerus*) forth of the writings of *Brentius*, *Myricus*, and *Andreas Musculus*, that they make nothing of the ascension of Christ, but a vanishing, or disappearing. What is this but making way for *Mahomet*? but what Scriptures, or Fathers, or times bask he wherein this Doctrine was ever taught before? d

c Sylvest. Eze-
canorius. Di-
al. de corrupt.
mor. art. 3. fol.
5. See *Andr.*
Muscul. and
Iseb. in refer.
Simleri.

d In vita *Bul-
ling.* fol. 55.

The Divisions of *Protestants*.

IF Ye would but consider, how the Lutherans are divided into *Antinomians*, *Osiandrians*, *Majorists*, *Synergists*, *Stancarians*, *Amsdorians*, *Flaccians*, *Substantiaris*, *Acidentarians*, *Adjaphorists*, *Musculans* of *Effingereans*, *Vibiquilists*, &c. So dissenting from, and persecuting one another, that they will not permit one another to live in the same Town, in so much, that *Oecolampadius* reckons up seventy seven changes, not onely in their explanations of Scripture, but also in certaine imaginary phantasies. (e) Or if we should consider the Divisions that are between the old and new *Sacramentaries*, the old, called *Zwinglians*: the new, *Calvinists*; with us, *Puritans*: in France, *Hugonots*: in other places *Formalists*, else-where *Familists*: somewhere *Brownists*: every where *Armi-*

e Lin. germ.
æqua. resp. ad
Luth. Prefat.

Arminians, Seekers, Dippers, Shakers, Adamists.

Luther complaining of seven Sects risen in two years ;
(f) *And we of new Sects rising every day ; If we should consider the severall species of Independency, how it hath brought Religion to nothing, but Confusion, we would conclude with Saint Augustine, That it is necessary, that (rent and divided into small pieces) we perish, who have preferred the swelling pride of our haughty Stomacks, before the most holy band of Catholick peace and Unity.* g

Whilst the Catholicks have no jars undecided, no differences uncomposed ; having one common Father, one Conductor and Adviser ; as Sir Edward Sands confesseth. (h) None contend about the Scripture, all Consent and Credit the Fathers, adhere to the Councils, submit to the holy Sea of Rome. And the Divisions that are, are but humane dissentions, as is confessed by Luther, (i) Beza, (k) Whitaker, (l) Fulk (m) &c.

Thus Religion, being at Unity with it selfe, is the true Speculum Creatoris, or looking glasse of the Creatour : wherein the full proportion of a Deity may be seen : but once broken into pieces, it may represent divers faces, but no true proportion : and loseth at once both its value, and its virtue.

I have thus presented Your Majesty, with a view of the Catholick Religion, asserted by the Fathers : and the Protestant Religion asserted by their founders. I shall humbly desire Your Majesties further patience, that Your Majestie will be pleased to consider the lives and Conversations of the one, and of the other : First the rare Sanctity, and admired holinessse, which all ages and writers have ascribed unto these holy Fathers. And the strange and unheard of blasphemies, wilenessse and wickednessse that are cast upon the

f Tom. 16.
fol. 335.

g Aug. cont.
Farm. l. i. c. 4.

h In his Relation of Religion Sect. 47.
fol. 5. 2, 8.

i Tom. fol.
380.

k Beza Epist. 1

l Whit. de

Eccles. cont.

Bell. cont. 2. q.

5. p. 327.

m Fulk ag.

Hesk. Sand.

&c. p. 293.

the other, not by any of their Adversaries; but by themselves upon one another: If these testimonies had been by any of our side, I could not have expected credit, but being by Protestants themselves, I cannot see how it should be denied.

Luther confesseth, saith the learned Protestant Hospinian, that he was taught by the devil, that the Masse was naught, and overcome with the devils reasons, he abolished it: a

The same confessed by himselfe: (b) I ingeniously confesse (saith Luther) that I cannot (henceforth) place Zwinglius in the number of Christians, (c) and further he affirms that he had lost whole Christ: (d) Zwinglius (saith Schlusselfburg) after the manner of all Hereticks was stricken with the spirit of giddinesse, and blindness, deriving it from the etimologie of his name, in dutch, von dem Schwindel. e

Gualterus calls Zwinglius, the Author of War, the disturber of peace, proud and cruell; and instances in his strange attempts against the Tygurines, his fellows, whom he forced by want, and famine, to follow his doctrine; and that he dyed in armor, and in the Warre. f

And Luther saith, he dyed like a thiefe, because he would compell others to his error. g

And he saith further, that he denyed Christ and is damn'd. h

*He tells us also, that the devill or the devills dam, used to appeare to Carolose, and taught him the exposition of, *this is my body.* (i) As also that he possessed him corporally; and that he was possessed with more devils then one. k Neither would he have any man wonder that he calls him devill: for he saith he hath nothing to doe with him: but has onely relation to him, by whom he*

is

a Hist. Sacr.
part. ult. f. 131.
b Tom. 7. Wit.
fol. 218.
c Tom. 2. Germ.
fol. 190.
d In fol. 182.

e Lin. 2 act. 1.

f In apolog.
pro Zwing.
1 tom. fol. 30,
31. and Osiander
Epist. Cent. 16.
p. 203.
g Luther collog.
lat. tom. 2. c.
de Advers.
h Luth. col. lat.
tom. 1. c. de
dam. & inferno.
i Tom. 3. Jen.
Germ. f. 68. fo
Chcunismus de
cæna p. 214.
k Luther loc.
com. class. 5.
c. 15. p. 47.

is obsest, who speaks by him. (1) *The last apparition of the devill to him, which was three dayes before his death, is recorded by Albert. m*

l Luth. tom. 3.
Jen. fol. 61.

If you look into Bezas Epigrams, printed at Paris, An. 1548. you will find pretty passages concerning his boy Andebors, and his wench Candida; and the businesse debated at large, concerning which sin is to be preferr'd; and his chusing the boy at last.

m Cont. Carolst. fol. 6. See Jo. Schutzi. 50 caus. c. 50.

Schlusselberg said, that Peter Martyr was a heretick, and dyed so. n

n Theol. Calv. l. 2. act. i.

Nicolaus Selneverus said; that Oecolampadius, in his doctrine built upon the sand. o And

o Seln. part. c. Enarrat. ger. in Psal. 1. 215.

(saith Luther) Emser: and Oecolampadius, and such like, were hiddenly slain by those horrible blowes and shakings of the devill. p

p Luth. tom. 7. fol. 30.

Simlerus saith, that Brentius Miricus, and Andrew Mafculus; in their writings, did nothing else but make way for the devill. q

q Siml. in vita Bulling. fol. 55.

Luther (saith Calvin) was infected with many vices; I would he had been more carefull in correcting his vices. r

r Calv. alledged by Schlus-
selb. theol. cal. lib. 2. fol. 126.

God, for the sin of pride, (wherewith Luther exalted himself) took away his true spirit. s

s Cont. Rheg. l. Germ. cont. Jo. Hess. de coena domini.

We have found (saith Oecalompadius) in the faith and confession of Luthers 12. Articles; whereof some are more vaine then is fitting; some lesse faithfull, and over-guilefully expounded; others again are false, and reprobate; but some there are which plainly dissent from the Word of God, and the Articles of Christian faith. t

t Oecol. resp. ad. Luth. confess. See Zuenckfeld. praef. super praecip. fidei. artic. & Hospin. hist.

Thou O Luther, saith Zwinglius, corruptest and adulterest the Scriptures, imitating therein the Marcionists, and the Arians. u

u Sacra part. 2. fol. 5.

u Zwing. tom. 2. fol. 412.

In translating and expounding of Scripture, *Luthers* errors are many, and manifest. *w*

Zwinglius tells us, that *Luther* affirms sometimes this, and sometimes that, of one and the same thing, that he is never at one with himself, having him with inconsistency, and lightness in the word of God. *a*

That he cares not what he saith, though he be found contradicting the Oracles of God: *b*

As sure as God is God, so sure, and devilish a lyer is *Luther*. *c*

Luthers writings containe nothing, but railing and reproaches: inso much that it maketh the Protestant Religion suspected, and hated. *d*

He calls an unainted King, Hen. 8. of England, a furious dolt, indued with an impudent and whorish face, without a vein of princely blood in his whole body; a lying Sophist; a damnable rotten worm, a basilisk, the progeny of an Adder; scurrilous lyer, covered with a ritle of a King; a clown, a block-head; foolish, wicked, and impudent *Mentz*: and saies, that he lies like a scurrilous knave: and thou liest in thy throat, foolish and sacrilegious King. *e*

Nor did he lesse raile at other Princes; as at the Duke of Brunswick, in his Booke called *Wider hans worst*, written purposely against him; as also against the Bishop of *Mentz*, one of the Princes Electors. *f* And against the Princes of Germany. *g*

He marvelle that he saith, that he had eaten a peck or two of Salt with the Devill, and that he knew the Devill very well, and that the Devill knew him againe. *h*

No marvelle that he confessed of himselfe, that the Devill sometimes passed through his brains. *i*

He marvelle that he said, the Devill did more frequently

w Bucer dial.
Contr. Melanct.

a Zwing. tom. 2.
fol. 458.

b Zwing. tom. 2.
resp. ad confes.
Luth.

c Jo. Camp. col-
loq. fac. Luth.
Tom. 2. c. de
adv. f. 354.

d Tigur. con-
fess. Orthod.
fol. 123, 123.

e Luth. Tom. 2.
fol. 333, 334.
333, 338, 340.

f Tom. 3.
Germ. fol. 533.
339, 360.

g Tom. 2.
Germ. fol.
190, 200.

h Luth. con. de
urb. fedam.

i Tom. 3. Jeh.
Germ. fol. 485.

quently sleep with him, and cling to him closer, then his Catharine. *h*

No marvel that he said that the Devil walked with him in his bed-chamber; and that he had one or two wonderfull Devils, by whom he was diligently and carefully served: and they no small Devils, but great ones; yea, Doctors of divinity, amongst the Devils. l

No marvel that his fellow Prot. could wonder how marvelously he bewrayed himselfe with his Devils; and that he could use such filthy words, so replenished with all the Devils in Hell. m

No marvel that they said that, never any man writ more filthily, more uncivilly, more lewdly, and beyond all bounds of Christian modesty, then did Luther. n

No marvel that he is so taxed for his obscenity in his Henzius Anglicus, against King Hen. the eight, for his beastlinesse in his Hans worst against the Jewes: for his filthy mentioning of Hogs, for his stincking repetition of turds and dunghils, in his Schemhamphorise: But if you will hear of his Master-piece, you must read the Book which he writ against the Pope; where he asks him, out of what mouth (O Pope) dost thou speak, is it out of that from whence thy farts doe burst? If it come thence, keep it to thy selfe: if it comes from that wherein thou powrest thy Corisca wine, let the Dog fill that with his excrements; good Assc doe not kick; kick not my little Pope: O my dear Assc, doe not so: fie how this little Pope hath bewrayed himselfe. o

Is this the way to win to his side? or to gaine souls to Christ? or to reforme Churches? or to confute heresies? It is observed, that Saint Paul in his Epistles repeated the sacred name of Iesus 500 times, and it is the observa-

h Luth. Colloq. mens Germ. fol. 281.

l Luth. 16. fol. 275.

m Tigur. tract. 3. consupra. Luth. confessio.

n Tigur. theol. Orthod. confess. fol. 14.

o Luth. cont. pontif. Rom. adiab. fund. in tom. 8. Jen. p. 207, 208.

tion of the learned Tygurin Divines, that so many times Luther hath used the name of Devill in his Bookes: and it is no marvaile that they burst out into this admiration; How wonderfull is Luther here, with his Devils! what impure words he useth, with how many Devils doth he burst?

p Theol. Tigr. confess. Germ. fol. 3. & part 3. fol. 114.

q Zwing. tom. 2. fol. 381.

Nor marvail that Zwinglius saith to him, we fill not our Books with so many Devils, nor doe we bring so many armies of Devils against thee.

If you can expect to gather figgs from thorns, or grapes from thistles, then ye may expect words from a sanctified spirit, so proceed from such a mouth, else not.

r Melanct. Epist. ad Freder. micon. Hols. hist. Sac.

What should I say more? Melancthon tells us, that Carlostadius was a barbarous fellow, without wit, without learning, without common sense, in whom was no signe of the holy Ghost: but manifest tokens of impiety.

Lastly, Hurterus Beza's owne fellow Protestant, thus saies of him, and casts this dirt in his face, which is so shamelesse a testimony, that you must give me leave to throw a laine vail over it, viz. Beza in fine libri, de absentia corporis Christi in coena scribit, Candida, sive Amascae suae, culum, imo partem diversam, magis adhuc pudendam, mundiora esse, quam illorum ora, qui simpliciter verbis Christi inherentes, credant se praesens Christi Corpus in coena sacra, ore suo accipere.

f Hur. explic. lib. concord. art. 7. p. 703.

And another: Beza, by his most filthy manners, was a disgrace to honest Discipline; who in sacrilegious verse published to the world, his detestable loves, his unlawfull carnall acts, whoredoms, and fowle adulteries: not content that himselfe onely should like a hog wallow in the durt of wicked lusts, but he must also pollute the ears of studious youth with his filth.

t Tilm. Helmsf. Ver. & Sanc. Conf.

I could enlarge my Paper to a volume of like instances in others, but these are the prime reformers of the Protestant Churches: and how the people edified under their Doctrine, these Narratives from their owne mouths shall tell you.

When we were seduced by the Pope (saith Luther) every man did willingly follow good works: and now every man neither saith, nor knoweth any thing, but how to get all to himselfe, by exactions, pillage, theft, lying, usury. ^a

Certainly, to speak the truth, there is many times found Conscionable, and plainer dealing amongst most Papists, then among many Protestants. And if we look narrowly to the ages past, we shall find more godlineffe, devotion and zeal, (though blind) more love, one toward another, more fidelity and faithfulness, every way in them, then is now to be found in us. ^a

If any man be desirous to see a great rabble of knaves, of persons turbulent, deceitfull, Cosoners, Usurers, let him goe to any City, where the Gospel is purely preached, and he shall find them there by multitudes. For it is more manifest then the day light, that there were never among the *Ethnicks*, *Turks*, or infidels more unbridled, and unruly persons, with whom all virtue and honesty is quite extinct, then are amongst the Professours of the Gospel. ^b

The children of them of the reformed Gospel grow every day worse, more untractable, and dare commit such crimes, as men of former times were never subject to. ^c

If you cast your eyes upon Protestant Doctours, you shall find that some of them moved through vaine glory, envious zeal, and a prejudicate opinion, disorder the true Doctrine, disperse, and earnestly defend the

^a Luth. Dom.
26. post Trin.
See Mr. Stubbs
motive to good
works, p. 44, 45.

^a Master Stubbs
motive, pag. 43.

^b Andr. Mus-
cul. Domin. 1.
Adv. See him
also lib. de Pro-
phet. & Sim.
Paulus in Serm.
Dom. 13. post
Trinit.
^c Jo. Wygand.
l. de bon. &
mal. Germ.

false; some of them without cause stir up contentions, and with inconsiderate spight defend them: many wrest their Doctrines every way, of purpose to please their Princes, and the people: by whose grace and favour they are maintained: they overthrow with their wicked life, all that they had formerly built with their true doctrine. *d*

d Paul Eber.
præfat. comm.
Philippi. in E-
pist. ad Cor.

How could the people be better, when their Ministers were so bad? like lips, like lettice. I will conclude all with the learned Protestant, Zanchius, and then you will neither wonder at one or other; I have read (saith he) the Latine copy of the Apology, and diligently read it over, not without choller, when I perceived what manner of writing, very many (let me not say for the most part, but all) doe use, in the Churches of the reformed Gospel, who would seeme (notwithstanding) to be Pastors, Doctors, and Pillars of the Church.

The state of the question, that it may not be understood, we often, (of set purpose) over-cloud with darknesse: things which are manifest, we impudently deny: things false, we (without shame) avouch: things plainly impious, we propose as the first principles of faith: things orthodoxall, we condemne of heresie: Scripture at our pleasure, we detort to our owne dreams: we boast of Fathers, when we will follow nothing lesse then their doctrine: to deceive, to calumniate, to raile, is familiar with us: so as we may defend our cause, good or bad, by right or by wrong; all other things we turne upside down: Oh times, Oh manners! *e*

e Zanch. epist.
ad Jo. Sturm.
this in line, l. 7.
& 8. Miscellau.

f Sutcliff. answ.
Cal. pet. p. 141.

It is no marvel that M. Sutcliff, saies, that the Protestant writers offered great violence to the Scriptures, expounding them contrary both to ancient Fathers, History, and common reason. f

It is no marvel that Cambden tells us, that Holland is a fruitfull province of heretiques: g

g Elizab. p. 300.

It is no marvell that Your royall Father tells us, that both Hungary, and Bohemia, abound with infinite varieties of sects. h

h K. James his Works, p. 371

It is no marvell, that he said he could never see a Bible well translated in English; and that the worst of all was the Geneva, whereunto were added notes, untrue, seditious, and favouring too much of dangerous, and traitterous conceits. i

i Page 45, 46.

It is no marvel that He protested before the great God, that you should never find among the Highland, or Border-theeves, greater ingratitude, more lies, and vile perjuries, then with those phanatick spirits. k

k K. James his Works, p. 161.

It is no marvel that M. Bancroft said that the Puritans of Scotland, were published in a Declaration by his Majestie, to be unnaturall Subjects, seditious, troublesome, and unquiet spirits, members of Sathan, enemies to the King, and the Common-wealth of their owne native Country. l

l Dang. position. 22.

And lastly, because your Church of England most followed Calvins doctrine of any of the rest, I shall shew you what end he made, answerable to his beginning, and course of life, written by two knowne and approved Protestant Authors, viz. God in the rod of his fury, visiting Calvin, did horribly punish him, before the fearfull hour of his unhappy death; for he so struck this heretick with his mighty hand, that being in despair, and calling, upon the Devill, he gave up his wicked soule, swearing cursing, and blaspheming, dying upon the disease of lyece and wormes, increasing in a most loathsome ulcer about his privie parts, so as none present could endure the stench;

m Theolog.
Calvinist. lib. 2.
fol. 72.
n li. de vita
Calvini.

stentch; these things are objected unto Calvin in publick writing, in which also horrible things are declared concerning his lasciviousnesse, his sundry abominable vices, and Sodomiticall lusts, for which last he was by the Magistrate (at Nayon) under whom he lived branded on the shoulder with a hot burning iron; *And this is said of him by Schlusberg. (m) She which is likewise confirmed by Jo. Herennius. n*

It may be your Majestie may taxt me of bitternesse, or for the discovery of nakednesse. But I hope you will give me leave to look what staffe I leane upon when I am to looke down upon so great and terrible a precipice as Hell, and to consider the rottennesse of the severall rounds of that ladder, which is proposed to me for my ascent unto heaven, and to forewarne others of the dangers I espie; their owne words can be none of my railing: nor their owne accusations, my error: except it be a fault, to take notice, of what is published, and make use of what I see: Ex ore tuo was our Saviours rule, and shall be mine. There hath not been used one Catholick Author throughout the accusation, and I take it to be the providence of God, that they should be thus infatuated, as to accuse one another, that good men may take heed how they rely upon such mens Judgements, in order to their eternall Salvation.

As to Your Majesties Objection, that we of the Church of Rome fell away from our selves, and that you did not fall away from us, as also to the common saying of all Protestants, bidding us to returne to our selves, and they will returne to us, we accept of their offer, we will doe so; that is to say, we will hold our selves to the same Doctrine, which the Church of Rome held, before she converted this Nation to Christianity, and then they cannot say, we fell away from them, or from our selves, whilst we maintaine the same Doctrine

Principle held before you were of us : that is to say, whilst we maintain'd the same Doctrine that we maintained during the four first Councils, acknowledged by most Protestants, and during Saint August. time concerning whom Luther himself acknowledged, That after the sacred Scriptures, there is no Doctor of the Church to be compared, (a) thereby excluding himself and all his associates from being prefer'd before him, concerning whom Master Field of the Church writes, that Saint Aug. was the greatest Father since the Apostles. (b) Concerning whom Covell writes, that he did shine in learning above all that ever did, or will appear. (c) Concerning whom Jewell appeals, as to a true and Orthodox Doctor. (d) Concerning whom Mr. Forrester. Non. Testigraph. calls him the Fathers Monarch. e And

Concerning whom Gomer acknowledges his opinion to be most pure. f

Concerning whom Master Whitaker doubts not, but that he was a Protestant. (g) And lastly, concerning whom your royall Father seemed to appeal, when he objected unto Card. Peron, That the face and exteriour form of the Church was changed since his time, and far different to what it was in his dayes, wherefore we will take a view of what it was then, and see whether we lose or keep our ground, and whether it be the same which you acknowledged then to be so firm.

Our Church believed then a true and reall presence, and the orall manducation of the body of Christ, in the Sacrament, as the prince of the Sacramentarians acknowledged (a) in these words from the time of S. Augustin, which was for the space of twelve hundred yeares, the opinion of corporall flesh, had already got the mastery. And in this quality she adored the Eucharist, (b) with out-

a Luth. loc. com. Class. 4. P. 45.

b lib. 3. fol. 170.

c. Covell. in his ans. to 90. Burges. d In his challenge at Pauls Crosse.

e In proem. P. 3.

f Gom. spec. veræ Eccles.

g Whit. ans. to f. Camp. in the cont. fol. 3. 2. parag. 28.

a Zwingl. lib. de vera & falsa relig. cap. de Eucharist.

b Chryf. in 1. Cor. Hom. 24.

outward gestures and adoration, *as* the true and proper body of Christ. Then the Church believed the body of Christ to be in the Sacrament^c; even besides the time that it was in use: *And for this cause* kept it after Consecration, for Domesticall Communions^d, to give to the sick^e, to carry upon the Sea^f, to send into far Provinces^g.

Then she believed that Communion under both kinds was not necessary for the sufficiency of participation, but that all the body, and all the blood was taken in either kind: *And for this cause*, in Domesticall Communions, in Communions for children, for sick persons by Sea, and at the hour of death it was distributed under one kind, onely.^b

Then the Church believedⁱ, that the Eucharist was a true, full, and intire sacrifice; not onely Eucharisticall, but^k propitiatory; and offered it as well for the living^l as the dead. *The faithfull and devout people of the Church* then made pilgrimages to^m the bodies of the Martyrsⁿ; pray'd to the Martyrs to pray to God for them: Celebrated their Feasts^o, revered their Reliques in all honourable forms. And when they had received help from God, by the intercession of the said Martyrs^p, they hung up in the Temples, and upon the Altars, erected to their memory, images of those parts of their bodies that had been healed.

The Church then held the Apostolicall traditions, to be equall to the Apostolicall writings; and held for Apostolicall traditions, *all that the Church of Rome now embraceth under that Title*: She then offered prayers for the dead^s, both publick and private, *to the end to procure for them, ease and rest*: *And held this custome as a thing necessary for the refreshment of their souls.* *The Church*

c Cyrill. Alex.
Ep. ad Cæsar.
pat.

d Cypr. de
lapsu.

e Euseb. hist.
lib. 7.

f Ambr. de o-
bit Sayer.

g Euseb. hist.
lib. 1.

h Paulin. in
vita Ambr.

Terul. ad ux.
c. 55. Basil.

Epist. ad Cæ-
sar. pat.

i Cypr. ad Cæ-
cil. c. 63.

k Euseb. de vita
Const. l. 4.

l Chryl. in
1 Cor. hom. 41.

m Basil. in 40.
Martyrs.

n Ambr. de vid.
o Aug. in Psal.

63. and 88.

p Hier. and
Marcell. ep. 17.

q Theod. de
Gr. aff. l. 8.

r Basil. de
Sanct. Spirit.

s Terul. de
mon. Aug. de
verb. Ap.

z Aug. de cura
pro mort.

Church then held the fast ^a of the forty dayes of Lent for a custome, not free, but necessary; and of Apostolicall tradition. And out of the time of Pentecost fasted all the Frydayes in the year in memory of the death of Christ, except Christmay-Day fell on a Fryday ^w, which she then excepted as an Apostolicall tradition: The Church then held ^x marriage after the vow of Virginity to be a sin: and reputed ^r those, who married together after their vowes, not onely for adulterers, but also for incestuous persons.

The Church held then ^z mingling of water with wine in the sacrifice of the Eucharist, for a thing necessary, and of Divine, and Apostolicall tradition. She held then ^a exorcismes, exsufflations, and renunciations, which are made in Baptisme, for sacred Ceremonies, and of Apostolicall tradition: She held then ^b, besides Baptisme and the Eucharist, Confirmation ^c; Marriage ^d, Orders, and extream Unction, for true and proper Sacraments which the Church of Rome now acknowledgeth: The Church, in the Ceremonies of Baptisme, used then ^e oyl, ^f salt, ^g wax-lights, ^h exorcismes, ⁱ the signe of the Crose, ^m the word Ephata, and other that accompany it, none of them without reason, and excellent signification. The Church held then ⁿ Baptisme for infants of absolute necessity: and for this cause then permitted, ^o lay men to baptise in danger of death, the Church used then holy water, consecrated by certain words and Ceremonies: and made use of it both for Baptisme, ^p and ^q against inchantments, and to make ^r exorcismes, and conjurations against evill spirits.

The Church held then divers degrees in the Ecclesiasticall Regiment, to wit, ^s Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Subdeacons, the Acolite, Exorcist, Reader and Porter consecrated and blessed them with divers Forms and Ceremonies: And in the Episcopall Order acknowledged, divers

^a Hier. ad Marcell. ep. 54.

^w Epiph. in Compen.

^x Epiph. Cont. Apost. Hæret. 17.

^y Chryl. ad Theod. Hier.

Cont. Jov. l. 1.

^z Cyr. Cæcil. epist. 63.

^a Aug. de pec. orig. cap. 40.

^b Aug. Cont. Pet. l. 3. c. 4.

^c Aug. de nupt. & Concc. 17.

^d Ambr. de pænir. c. 7.

^e Leo 1. epist.

^f Aug. Cont. Parm. l. 2. c. 13.

^g Cyp. epist. 70.

^h Conc. Carth. 3. cap. 5.

ⁱ Greg. Naz. de bapt.

^j Aug. ep. 10.

^k Aug. Cont. Jul. l. 6. c. 8.

^m Ambr. de sacr. l. 1.

ⁿ Aug. de an. & evis orig. l. 3.

^o Tert. de bapt. p. Basil. de S. Spirit. c. 17.

^p Epiph. hæret. 30.

^q Theod. Hist. Eccles. l. 3. c. 2.

^r Concil. Laod. c. 24. Concil. Carth. 4. 6. 2.

b Hier. ad Damas. Ep. 17.
 Concil. Chal. ep. ad Leon.
 i Hier. pref. in paralip.
 k Aug. Epist. 57. de Doctr. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 13.
 * Aug. Epist. 118. & Plal. 63. & 38.
 l He. ad He. Ep. 3. Theod. Hist. Eccles. 1. 2. c. 27.
 m Op. 1. p. 19. n Theod. Hist. 1. 5. c. 8. l. 6d. de Div. off. 1. c. 4.
 o Greg. Naz. de pac. or. 1.
 p Cyril. Hier. Car. Mat. 5.
 q Co. Laod. c. 9.
 r Aug. de Civ. Dei. 1. 2. c. 8.
 s Hier. co. Vigil. Hier. co. Vigil.
 u Hier. c. Vigil.
 w Greg. Naz. in Jul. orat. 2.
 x Euseb. de Vita Const.
 y Paulin Epist. 12. Basil. in Martyr. Bar.
 z Prudent. in S. Cassian.
 a Tert. de coron. milit.
 b Cyril. Cont. Jul. 1. 6.
 c Hier. in Vita Hil.
 d Achan. cont. Idol.

seats of Jurisdiction of positive right; *to wit*, Archbishops, Primates, Patriarchs, and ^b one Supereminent (by Divine law) which was the Pope, without whom nothing could be decided, appertaining to the universall Church; and the want of whose presence, either by himselfe, or his Legats, or his Confirmation, made all Councils (pretended to be universall) unlawfull.

In the Church then the service was said throughout the East, in Greek, and throughout the West^k, as well in Africa, as in Europe, in Latin: although that in none of the provinces (except in Italy, and the Cities, where the Romane Colonies resided) the Latine tongue, was understood by the common people. She observed then the distinction of feasts^r and ordinary dayes, the Distinction of Ecclesiasticall and lay habits: the^m reverence of sacred vessels, the custome ofⁿ shaming and^o unction for the collation of orders; the Ceremony of the^p Priest, washing his hands at the Altar, before the consecration of the Mysteries. She then^q pronounced a part of the service, at the Altar with a low voice, made^r processions with the reliques of Martyrs / kissed them^s, carried them in clothes of silke, and vessels of gold^u, took and esteemed the dust from under their reliquaries: accompanied the dead to their sepulchres, with^w wax tapers in sign of joy, for the certainty of their future resurrection. The Church then had the picture of Christ, and of his Saints, both^x out of Churches, y and in them: and upon the very^z Altars, (not to adore them with God-like worship) but by them, to reverence the Souldiers and Champions of Christ.

The faithfull then used the^a sign of the Crosse, in all their Conversations^b; painted it on the portal of all the houses of the faithfull^c; gave their blessing to the people with their hand, by the signe of the Crosse^d, employed

it to drive away evill spirits, *e* proposed in Jerusalem the very Crosse to be adored on good Friday: Finally, the Church held then *f* that to the Catholick Church onely belongs the keeping of the Apostolicall tradition, the Authority of interpretation of Scripture; and the decision of Controversies of faith; and that out of the succession of her communion, of *h* her Doctrine; and her ministry, there was neither Church, nor Salvation.

Neither will I insist with you onely upon the word, then, but before, and before, and before that, even to the first age of all, will I shew you our doctrine of the reall presence, and holy Sacrifice of the Masse; Invocation of Saints; Veneration of Reliques and Images, Confession, and Priestly absolution; Purgatory and prayer for the dead; Traditions, &c.

In the first Age, or hundred of years, Saint Augustine was for the reall and corporall presence. *a*

In the fourth Age, Saint Ambrose. *b*

In the third Age Saint Cyprian. *c*

In the second Age, or hundred of years, S. Irenæus. *d*

And in the first Age *e* Saint Ignatius, Martyr, and Disciple of Saint John the Evangelist.

Concerning the honour and invocation of Saints, In the fifth Age we find Saint Augustine, *f* praying to the Virgin Mary, and other Saints.

In the fourth Age, we find Greg. Naz. praying to S. Basil the great. *g*

In the third Age, we find S. Origen, praying to Father Abraham. *h*

In the second Age, Justin Martyr. *i*

And in the first age, in the Liturgy of S. James the lesse. *k*
For the use and veneration of holy Reliques and Images, and chiefly of the Holy Crosse; in the fifth age, Saint Augustine. *l*

e Paul Ep. 11.
f Tert. de præscript. Iren. l. 3. c. 3. & l. 4. c. 32.
g Cyp. de unit. Eccles. Conc. Car. 4. c. 1.
h Hier. Contr. Lucif. Aug. de util. cred. c. 8.
i Cyp. ad pub. Ep. 63. ad mag. Ep. 67. Hier. ad Tit. c. 3.
a Aug. Conc. 1. in Psal. 33.
b Lib. 4. de Sacra. c. 5. and l. de iis, qui misteris initiantur, c. 9.
c Serm. de Coena Dom. prope init. dl. 4. c. 32. in fin.
d Ep. ad smirnum. ut cit. a Theod. Dial. 3.
f Serm. de Verb. Apost. prope init. & medic. c. 40. & l. de loquutionibus in gen. prope finē.
g In Orat. 20. quæ est in laudem, in Basil. mag. and Saint Hier. Cont. Vigil. 13. initio.
h Initio sui lamenti.
i Apol. 2. ad Anton. pium. Imper. non longe ab initio.
k Ante Med.
l Tract. 118. in Joan sine.

m Ad Ando-
chium princip.
n Hom. 8. in
diversos Evan-
gelisti locos.

o Ad quæst.
28. Gentilium.

p Epist. ad
Phil. ante Med.

q Hom. 49.
ante Med.

r Sui regulis
brevior.

inter. 288.

f Ser. de lapsis.
1. de poen. c. 10

u Clement
Rom. Epist. 1.

a De Civ. Dei,
1. 26. c. 24. and
also Ser. 41. de

sanct. prope
init. also Ser.

22. de Verb.
Apost.

b Ambr. in
1 Cor. 3. S. Hier.

in Com. in
c. 11. proverb.

c Ep. 3. ad Ant.
post. med.

d 1. de animæ
c. 58. de Corona

milit. c. 3. 4.

l Clem. Rom.
Ep. 1. de S.

Petr. prope fin.

j 1. 4. de bapt.
Con. Donat.

c. 24.

g lib. de Sp.
Sancto. c. 27.

h Hæres. 61.

i lib. 3. cap. 4.

k Arcopag. c. 1.
Eccles. Hierar.

In the fourth Age Athanasius. m

In the third Age Origen. n

In the second Age St. Justin Martyr. o

And in the first Age S. Ignatius. p.

Concerning Confession and Absolutions: In the fifth Age S. August. q

In the fourth Age S. Basil. the Great. r

In the third Age S. Cypr. s

In the second Age Tertull. t

And in the first Age S. Clement. u

Now concerning Purgatory, and Prayer for the dead in the fifth Age S. Augustin. a

In the fourth Age S. Ambrose. b

In the third Age S. Cypr. c

In the second Age Tertull. d

And in the first Age S. Clement. e

Concerning Traditions in the fifth Age S. Aug. f

In the fourth Age S. Basil. g

In the third Age S. Epiphanius. h

In the second Age S. Irenæus. i

And in the first Age S. Dennis. k

Now suppose that all these quotations be right. The saving of a soul, of your own soul, of the soul of a King, of the souls of so many Kingdoms: and the gaining of that Kingdom for a reward, (which in comparison of these Earthly ones (for which you so often fight, so much strive, and labour so much for to obtain) your tetrarchate would be a gain for you to lose it, so that you might but obtain that) would be worth the search; and when you have found them to be truly cited, I dare trust your judgement, that it will tell you, that we have not changed our Countenance, nor shed our Colours, nor fallen away, nor altered our Religion, nor forsaken our first Love, nor denied our Principles, nor brought Novel-

ties

ties into the Church, (but that we doe antiquum obtinere) whereby we should be forsaken of you, for forsaking our selves: but rather that we should win you unto us, by being still the same, we were when we won you first unto us, and were at the beginning. And is it for the honour of the English Nation, famous for the first Christian King, and the first Christian Emperour, to forsake her Mother Church, so renowned for antiquity, and to annex their Religion as a codicell to an appeal of a company of Protesters, against a decree at Spira: and to forsake so glorious a name as Catholick, and to take a name upon them, wherein they had neither right nor interest; and then to take measure of the Scottish Discipline for the new fashion of their souls, and to make to themselves posies of the weedings of that Garden, into which Christ himself came down^a, upon which both the north and south winds do blow^b, in which is a well of living waters and streams from Lebanon^c: about which is an enclosure of brotherly affection^d. Will you forsake the Rose of Sharon, and the Lillie of the Vallies for such a Nose-gay? For I shall make it apparent unto your Majesty, that the Doctrines which Protestants now hold, as in opposition unto us, were but so many condemned heresies, by the Ancient and Orthodoxall Fathers of the Church, and never opposed by any of them: As for example, Protestants hold that the Church may erre; this they had from the Donatists, for which they were frequently reprov'd by St. Augustin.^e

Protestants deny unwritten traditions, and urge Scripture onely. This they had from the Arrians, who were condemned for it by St. Epiphanius, and S. Augustin both^f.

Protestants teach, that Priests may Marry; this they had from Vigilantius, who is condemned for it by St. Hieronimus g.

^a Cant. 6. 1.

^b Cant. 4. 16.

^c Cant. 4. 15.

^d Cant. 4. 12.

^e Cant. 2. 1.

^e Passim, cont. Donat.

^f Epiph. Her. 75. Aug. cont. maxim. l. 1. c. 2. & ult. g Con. Vigilant. c. 1.

Pro

Protestants deny prayer for the dead : this they had from Arrius, for which he is condemned by Saint August: and Epiphanius both. d

d Aug. hæz. 53.
Epiph. hæz. 75.

Protestants deny Invocation of Saints : this they had from Vigilantius, for which he was condemned by Saint Hieron. e

e Hier. Con.
Vigil. c. 3.

Protestants deny Reverence to Images : this they had from Xenias, for which he is reproved by Nicephorus. f

f Hist. l. 16. c. 27
and 55.

Protestants deny the reall Presence : this they had from the Carpenaites, who were, saith Saint Augustin, the first Hereticks, that denied the reall Presence : and that Judas was the first Suborner and Maintainer of this heresie. g

g Aug. in Psal.

Protestants deny Confession of sins to a Priest : so did the Novatian Hereticks, and the Montanists, for which they are reproved by Saint Ambrose and Saint Hieron. h

h Ambr. li. de
pœnit. c. 7.
Hier. Epist. ad
Marcel. 54.

Protestants say that they are justified by Faith onely : this they had from the pseudo-Apostles, for which they are condemned by St. Augustin. i

i Aug. de fide
& opor. c. 14.

Lastly, as I have shewed Your Majesty, that Your Church, as it stands in opposition to ours, is but a congeries of so many heresies, to which I could easily make an enlargement: but that I fear, I have been too tedious already; So I shall make it appeare, that our Church as she stands in opposition unto yours, is true and right, even your selves being witnesses, and you shall find our Doctrine among your owne Doctors. First the Greek Church, whom you court to your side, as indeed they are Protestants according to your vulgar reception, being you call all those Protestants, who are or were in any Opposition to the Church of Rome, though in their Tenents otherwise, they never so much doe disagree.

For

For the Greek Church with which you so often hit us in the teeth and take to be of your faction, she holds Invocation of Saints, Adoration of Images, Transubstantiation, Cōmunion in one kind for the sick, and many others.

Master Parker confesseth, that Luther crossed himselfe morning and evening, and is never scene to be painted praying, but before a Crucifix. a

As touching the Invocation of Saints (saith Luther) I think with the whole Christian Church, and hold, that Saints are to be honoured by us, and invocated b. I never denyed Purgatory (saith Luther) and yet I believe it, as I have often written and confessed c. If it is lawfull, (saith Luther,) for the Jews to have the picture of Cæsar upon their Coins; much more is it lawfull for Christians to have in their Churches Crosses and Images of Mary d; and lastly he maintained the reall Presence. e

But let us goe a little further, and consider what they held, whom ye call your Predecessours, under whom ye shrowd your Visibillity, and on whom you look beyond Luther, for your Doctrines Patronage, viz. First upon the Hussites, who brake forth about the year 1400. they held seven Sacraments f. Transubstantiation g, the Popes primacy h, and the Masse i, as Fox in his acts and monuments acknowledgeth.

Let us goe further, and consider Wickliffe, (our owne Countrey-man,) who appeared about the year 1370. he maintained holy water k, worship of Reliques, and Images l, Intercession of the blessed Virgin Mary m, the rites and Ceremonies of the Masse n, all the seven Sacraments o. Moreover, he held Opinions contrary, and condemned both by Catholick and Protestants, as that if a Bishop or Priest be in any mortal sin, his Ordaining, Consecrating, or

Serm. de Assump. Mariæ. n Idem de apostasia c. 18. o Idem in postill. sup.

a Against Simb. part. 1. c. 2. sect. 30. p. 105. See Jo. Crevel. refut. Cerem. missæ p. 188. Jo. Manl. Loc. Com. p. 636. b Purgat. quorund. art. & in Ep. ad Georg. Spal.

c Tom. 7. fol. 132. adversus bullam. See him also in disp. Lips. c. de purgat. & resolut. de indulg. Conclus. 16. See likewise

Zwingl. Tom. 2. fol. 378.

d Luth. in Consolat. prol. ab. l. 6 See this cited forth of Luth.

by Hass. Hist. Sac. p. 2. f. 33. e See Zwingl.

Tom. 2. f. 375. f p. 2. 16.

g Pag. 209. b Pag. 217. art. 7. 8.

i Luth. in Colloq. Germ. c. de missa.

k Wick. de blasphem. cap. 17. l Idem de Eucharist. c. 9.

m Idem in

c. 15. Marci.

p Acts & mon.
p. 96. art. 4.
q Osiand. E-
pist. Hist. Ec-
cles. p. 459.
art. 43.
r Act. & mon.
p. 96.

Baptizing is of no effect p. He condemned lawfull Oaths with the Anabaptists q. Lastly he maintained, that any Ecclesiasticall Ministers were not to have any temporall possessions r. This last Opinion was such savory Doctrine, that rather then some of those times would not hearken to that, they would listen to all; as the greedy appetites to Bishops Lands, make some now adayes to hearken unto any thing, that Cryers downe of Bishops shall foment.

f In Epist. 244.
p. 450.

To goe further yet to the Waldenses, descended from the race of one Waldo, a Merchant of Lions, who brake out about the year 1220. These men held the reall Presence s, for which they were reproved by Calvin. These men extolled the merit of voluntary poverty; they held Transubstantiation t, and many other opinions which most Protestants now way allow. u

t Illyricus Catalog. Test. p. 1498.
u Idem Catalog. Test. pag. 1502.

And lastly, I shall run your pedegree to the radix, and utmost Derivation, that the best read Herauld in the Protestant Genealogy, can run its line, and that is to the Waldenses, and to Berengarius, who broacht his heresie in the year 1048. and he held all the points of Doctrine that we held, onely he differed from us in the point of Transubstantiation. And for this cause they took him into the name and number of Protestants and Reformers, notwithstanding he presently afterwards recanted and died a Catholick. So it ends, where it never had beginning.

Finally: if neither prescription of 1600 years possession, and continuance of our Churches Doctrine, nor our evidence out of the word of God, nor the Fathers witnessings to that evidence: nor the Decrees of Councils: nor your owne acknowledgments, be sufficient to mollifie and turne your royall heart, there is no more means left for truth, or me, but I must leave it to God, in whose hand are the hearts of Kings.

A N A N S W E R

TO THE

Marquesse of *WORCESTER*

His Reply to the *KINGS*
Paper.



Our MAJESTY is pleased to wave all the Markes of the true Church, and to make recourse unto the Scriptures.

Ans. 1. His MAJESTY did not wave all the Markes of the true Church, assigned by the Marquesse, but shewed them to be such as may (without distinction and further explication) belong to a false Church. From *Jer. 44. 16.* His MAJESTY shewed that Antiquity, Succession and Universality was alledged in defence of Idolatry. That *Demetrius* (*Acts 19.*) alledged Antiquity and Universality for the worship of *Diana*; and that *Symmachus* alledged Antiquity as a plea for all heathenish Idolatry and Superstition, page 47. That *Ezechiel* bids, *Be not stiff-necked as your fore-fathers were*, page *Ibid.* These words (the place being not cited) I confesse, I cannot find, but there are those which are equivalent, *Ez. 20. 30.* *Are ye polluted after the manner of your*

Marquesse
page 52.

* What is there also in His Majesty's Paper cited out of *Prudentius*, is through some mistake ascribed to *Prudentius*, whereas it was only the object of *Symmachus*, and answered by *Prudentius*, who wrote against *Symmachus*, as also did *Amb.*

Fathers? and commit you whoredome after their abominations? So the Prophet *Zachary* cries, *Be ye not as your Fathers, Zach. 1. 4.* The like may be seen in other places. His Majesty likewise alledgeth our Saviour telling us, that we must not so much hearken to what was said by them of old time, as to that which he shall tell us, *Mat. 5. 21. &c.* (not as it is cited, 21. 12.) pag. 48. It is strange therefore that the Marquesse should say, that all the marks of the true Church were waved by His Majesty. As for the marks set down by the Marquesse, our learned writers have over and over shewed the insufficiency of them, so that there is no need now to say much. First for Universality, it is certaine that error may spread for a while more universally then truth. So did *Gentilisme* for many ages, it overspread in a manner the whole World. Onely in *Judah* was God known, *Psal. 76. 1.* Onely the people of the *Jews* had Gods saving truth among them, all the World besides did lie in grosse ignorance, and damnable error, *Psal. 147. 19, 20. Joh. 4. 22. Rom. 3. 1, 2. 1 Thess. 4. 5. Eph. 2. 11, 12. Acts 14. 16. & 17. 30.* So for a while *Arrianisme* did beare all the sway, in so much that as *Hierome* observed, *The World groaned, and wondered to see it selfe become an Arrian.* So also did *Pelagianisme*, as *Bradwardine* sometimes Archbishop of *Canterbury* complained. *As in times past (saith he) against one true Prophet there were 850 Prophets of Baal, and the like, to whom an innumerable company of people did adhere: So also now in this cause, how many, O Lord, doe with Pelagius fight for Free will against Thy Free grace? The whole*

Hac defensio
communis fu-
roris est fure-
ntium multitu-
do, Mimatius
Belix.

Ingemuit orbis,
& Arrianum se
esse miratus est.
Micro, advers.
Luciferian.

Sicut olim contra unicum Dei Prophetam 850. Prophetæ Baal, & similes sunt reperti, quibus & innumerabilis populus adhaerebat: ita & hodie in hac causa quos Domine, cum Pelagius pro libero arbitrio contra gratiam gratiam tuam pugnant? Bradwardine de causa Dei in Praefat.

Totus penè mundus post hunc abit, & erroribus ejus faver, dum ferè omnes communiter æstimant solius liberi arbitrii viribus se posse declinare à malo, facere bonum, &c. Bradw. de caus. Dei lib. 2. cap. 31.

that even the *Romanists* themselves are forced to confesse it)

should

should sit upon many waters, Revel. 17. 1. and that by those waters are meant Peoples, and Multitudes, and Nations, and Tongues, v. 15. This note therefore, viz. Universality, is farre from proving the Church of Rome to be the true Church. As for the Scriptures which the Marquesse citeth, viz. *Esay* 2. 2. *Psal.* 2. 8. (not as it is mis-printed 2.) and *Mat.* 24. (not 20) 14. these and the like places only shew that in the time of the Gospel the Church should not (as before it was) be confined to one Nation, but should be extended unto all, so that Gentiles as well as Jewes, as well one Nation as another should have admittance into it, the middle wall of partition being now broken down, *Ephes.* 2. 14. So that there is neither Greeke nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all, and in all. *Col.* 3. 11.

2. For Antiquity, it is true, the Prophet *Jeremy* bids, *Aske for the old paths, where is the good way, and walke therein.* *Ier.* 6. 16. And so we grant that primary antiquity is a sure note of truth, for error being a deviation and swerving from truth, it must needs be that truth is more ancient then error. But there is a secondary antiquity which is no argument of truth. For there is *vetustas erroris*, as *Cyprian* observed long agoe, an antiquity of error. The woman of *Samaria* could say, *Our Fathers worshipped in this Mountaine*; yet our Saviour answered her, *I see worship yee know not what.* *Joh.* 4. 20. 22. And *Symmachus* (whom His Majesty cited) could bring in heathenish Rome thus pleading antiquity, *Let me use those ceremonies, which mine ancestors have used. It's too late, and too great an injury to reforme me now I am old.* This plea, I dare say our adversaries themselves will not allow as used by *Symmachus*; and why then should we allow it, as they use it?

Thirdly, for Visibilty, it is granted that ordinarily the Church is visible, i.e. that there is a visible company of such as professe the truth, though the places cited by the Marquesse doe not evince so much. He saith, *David* compares the Church to a *Tabernacle in the Sun.* He meanes *Psal.* 19. 4. where indeed according to the vulgar Latine translation it is, *He hath set his Tabernacle in the Sun*; but * *Genebrard* is forced to expound it by an *Hypallage* posuit in Tabernaculo suo; i.e. in coelis: unde Hebr. Soli posuit tentorium in eis.

thus,

Bellar. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 2. cap. 2. *Ril.* in Apoc. 14. & 17.

Id verum quodcunque primum; id adulterum quodcunque posterius. *Tert. advers. Prax.* c. 4.

Cyp. Epist. 74. Edit. Pamel.

Utar ceremoniis avitis, sera & contumeliosa est emendatio senectutis. *Sym.*

*In sole posuit Tabernaculum suum. *Solem.*

Genebr.

thus, *He hath set the Sun in his Tabernacle, that is, in the heavens.* For (as he confesseth) the Hebrew runs thus, *He hath set a Tabernacle for the Sun in them.* Now what is this to the Visibility of the Church? or how doth it concerne the Church at all? Neither do I see, that (as the Marquesse alledgeth) our Saviour compares the Church to a candle in a candlestick, not under a bushell, *Mat. 5. 15.* But either (as *Iansenius* a Romish Writer doth expound it) our Saviour there spake of his Apostles, who as a candle in a candlestick were to give light unto the dark world by the preaching of the Gospel. Or else in generall he shewed the duty of all, *viz.* That in their places and callings they ought to be a means to enlighten others, especially by their good example. This sense is agreeable to that which follows immediately *ver. 16. Let your light so shine forth before men, &c.* So when our Saviour saith *Mat. 24. 26. If they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not forth: Behold, he is in the secret chambers, believe it not.* It is nothing to the Churches visibility, but onely he foreshews that many should come in his name, pretending themselves to be Christ, and forewarnes to beware of them. These places alledged by the Marquesse, are but little to the purpose, though (as I said) it is granted, that ordinarily the Church (*i. e.* the company of such as profess the truth) is visible. Yet neverthelesse we hold that sometimes through persecution, and prevalence of error, the Church may be so obscured, as to be scarcely visible. Thus it was in *Elias* his time, when he complained unto God, saying, *The children of Israel have forsaken thy Covenant, throwne downe thine Altars, and slaine thy Prophets with the sword, and I, even I* *am * left, and they seeke my life to take it away. 1 King. 19. 10.* And what great visibility was there of the Church, when both Priests, and People, were conspired together against Christ, to put him to death, and his Disciples also generally forsook him, and fled from him. So when the heresie of *Arrius* overspread all, so that such as were orthodox and sound in the faith, could scarce appear; † *Hilarius*, who lived in those times, saith, that mountains, and woods, and lakes, and Prisons, and deep pits, were more safe then Churches, and publick places of Gods worship, these being all possessed by the *Arrians*, and the true believing Christians having onely the other to lurke and lie hid in. How visible also

* I am left alone, *Rom. 11. 3*

† *Hilarius contra Auxent:* Montes mihi, & silvae, & lacus, & carceres, & voragine, sunt tutiores, &c.

was the Church like to be, when that should be fulfilled which is written *Revel. 13. 15, 16, 17.* that as many as would not worship the Beast, should be killed. And that all both great and small should be forced to receive a marke in their right hand, or in their foreheads. And that none should buy, or sell, save he that had the marke, or the name of the Beast, or the number of his name. Bellarmine himselve saith, It is certaine that the persecution by Antichrist shall be most grievous, and most notorious, so that all publick ceremonies of Religion and Sacrifices shall cease. * And againe, that in the time of Antichrist the publike service of the Church shall cease through the grievousnesse of persecution, and that Antichrist shall interdict all divine worship, &c.

igionis ceremoniarum, & sacrificia. *Bell. de Pom. Rom. l. 3. c. 7.* * Denique quod Antichristi tempore propter atrocitatem persecutionis cessare debeat publicum, & quotidianum Ecclesiarum officium, &c. Antichristum interdicturum omnem divinum cultum. *Ibid.*

Certum est Antichristi persecutionem fore gravissimam, & notissimam, ita ut cessent omnes publicæ religionis ceremoniæ.

4. For Succession of Pastours, which the Marquesse saith is required in a true Church, and is onely to be found in the Church of Rome. We must distinguish of Succession: There is a succession of Persons, and a succession of Doctrine; the former succession without the latter is to no purpose. The Priests that condemned Christ had a personal succession, but that was worth nothing, they wanting doctrinall succession. They did personally succeed those that were before them, and they others, and so on till they came to *Aaron*: but they could not shew the like succession of their doctrine. So neither can they of the Church of Rome shew that they hold the same faith which was delivered by the Apostles; and therefore though they can shew that their Popes doe personally succeed one another from the very times of the Apostles, it availes nothing. * *Bellarmino*, though he struggle a little about it, yet cannot deny but that a succession of persons is to be found in the Greek Church, and therefore grants that it doth not necessarily follow, that where such succession is, there is also a true Church. Yea, he saith, that all those Patriarchall Churches had for a long time Bishops, that were manifest Heretiques, and that therefore the succession of ancient Pastours was interrupted. What is this else but to confesse that a succession of Pa-

* *Bell. de Eccles. l. 4. c. 8.* Non colligitur necessario, ibi esse Ecclesiam, ubi est successio. Omnes Ecclesiarum illarum Patriarchales habuerunt per longa tempora Episcopos manifestos hæreticos, & proinde interrupta est veterum Pastorum successio.

stours.

flours without a succession of the true doctrine is no mark of a true Church. The ancient Doctors of the Church, tis true, have sometimes used this argument drawne from succession, to convince Heretiques, but so as to shew that a succession of doctrine did concur with a succession of persons. Yea they plainly shew, that it was succession of doctrine, which they did stand upon, and

(a) Oportet adherere his, qui Apostolorum doctrinam custodiunt. *Iren.* l. 4. c. 44. And c. 43. he calls this Principalem successionem.

(b) Non habent Petri hereditatem, qui fidem Petri non habent. *Amb.* de penit. l. 2. c. 6.

(c) Ipsa doctrina eorum cum Apostolica comparata, ex diversitate & contrarietate sua pronuntiabit, neq; Apostoli alicujus auctoritas esse, neq; Apostoli. *Tertul.* de prescrip. c. 32.

(d) In eadem fide conspirantes, non minus Apostolicæ deputantur pro consanguinitate doctrinæ. *Ibid.*

that without this they made no account of the other. (a) *We must adhere unto those (saith Irenæus) who keep the doctrine of the Apostles.* This succession of doctrine he calls the principall succession. So (b) *Ambrose, They do not succeed Peter, who have not the faith of Peter.* And (c) *Tertullian speaking of Heretiques, saith, Their doctrine being compared with the Apostles doctrine, shewes that it was not received from the Apostles, nor from any Apostolicall teachers.* And speaking of Churches planted since the Apostles times, he saith, That (d) *they agreeing in the same faith, are nevertheless accounted Apostolicall for the consanguinity of doctrine.*

5. For Unity in doctrine; by which the Marquesse proves the Roman Church to be the true Church: I answer, that Unity without Verity will not prove it, and the one is not alwayes necessarily accompanied with the other. *The words of the Prophets declare good unto the King with one mouth, said the messenger to Micah, 1 King. 22. 13.* They were about foure hundred Prophets, ver. 6. and all of them did agree in one; yet they prophesied falsly for all that, there was a lying spirit in the mouth of all those Prophets, how unanimous soever they were, ver. 22. Neither is there such unity in the Church of Rome as is pretended. The difference betwixt the Dominicans and the Jesuits about Gods decrees, the concurrence of his grace, and the determination of mans will; this difference (I say) betwixt them is as great, and as important as any (I think) that is amongst Protestants, Neither doth it suffice to say (as the Marquesse doth) that the Church hath not determined any thing in these points, and therefore such difference about them is not against the Churches unity.

For

For if the Popes authority be so great, and his judgement so infallible, as they pretend, why hath he not decided the controversie, and so put an end to the difference long ere this? Besides (which the Marquesse took no notice of) they of the *Romane Church* differ much about the very head of it, the Pope himselfe. For some will have him to be above a generall councill, & others hold the councill to be above the Pope: and this also was the determination both of the councill of *Constance*, and of the councill of *Basill*. Finally, I grant, that unity in the truth is much to be desired, and so much the places cited by the Marquesse doe prove, viz. *1 Cor. 1. 10. Eph. 4. 3. Acts 2. 42. Phil. 1. 27. & 2. 2.* yet we see that the Apostle doth acknowledge the Church of *Corinth* a true Church notwithstanding the differences and divisions that were in it, so that all disunion of people is not enough to dis-church them. Neither if the confessions of the reformed Churches be considered, as they ought to be, wil the differences that are among them (however particular persons be exorbitant) be found so many, and so great (though too many, and too great; I grant) as our adversaries of *Rome* would make them.

6. And lastly, for the conversion of Nations, which the Marquesse also will have to be a marke of the true Church, and thereby prove that the Church of *Rome* is it, and not the Church of Protestants; I answer, that the Scriptures which hee alledgeth, viz. *Esay 49. 23. and 60. 16. and Psal. 2. 8.* doe shew indeed, that in the time of the Gospell the *Gentiles* should be converted, and joyned to the Church, which the Scripture of the New Testament, and experience also shewes to have been accomplished. But they doe not shew either that every true Church must necessarily evidence it selfe to be a true Church by working a conversion in infidels, or that every Church that doth worke any conversion in that kind, must therefore be acknowledged to be a true Church. The Scribes and Pharisees did make Proselytes, and were very zealous in it, yet nevertheless were guilty of grosse errors, which all were to beware of as most pernicious, *Mat. 23. 15.* Besides, there is a conversion as from unbelieve to faith, so from misbelieve to a right and sound faith. And though Protestants have done little or nothing it may be in the former kinde of conversion, so as to convert meer

Infidels, yet in the other kinde, *vis.* in converting mis-believers, they have done much. This the Marquesse (*pag. 44.*) is pleas'd to call *perversion* rather than *conversion*; but that must be judg'd by the consideration of the Doctrines held by Protestants. As for those conversions wrought in the Indies by the Romanists, we may well conceive that it was not so much the word preached by the Jesuits, as the sword brandish'd by the Spaniards, that did worke them. †

† Non satis liquet mihi an fides Christiana fuerit barbaris hæcenus ita propofita, & annuntiatæ, ut teneantur credere sub novo peccato. --- Miracula & signa nulla audio, nec exempla vitæ adeo religiosa: contra multa scandala, seu facinora, & multas impietates; unde non videtur, quod religio Christiana satis commodè & piè sit illis prædicata, ut illi teneantur acquiescere; quanquam videntur multi religiosi, & alii Ecclesiastici viri, & vitæ, & exemplo, & diligenti prædicatione sufficienter operam & industriam adhibuisse in hoc negotio, nisi ab aliis, quibus alia cura est, impediti essent. *Francisco de Vicor. Relect.* 4. Sect. 38.

Franciscus de Victoria (a learned Writer among the Papiſts) writing of the Indians, saith he did not see, that the Christian faith was so propounded and declared to them, as that under the guilt of a new sin they were bound to embrace it. He heard (he sayes) of no Miracles, and Signes that were wrought, nor of very good examples of life that were given, but on the contrary of many scandalous acts, and many impieties. Whereupon he conceiveth, that Christian religion was not so conveniently and properly preached to that barbarous people, as that they were bound to acquiesce in it, though he grants, that there were many religious, and other Ecclesiasticall men, who

both by life and example, and also by diligent preaching did sufficiently doe their indeavour, but that they were hindred by others, who minded other matters. Thus I have as briefly as I could gone over the marks, which the Marquesse assigneth of the true Church, and that because he saith that his Majesty did wave them all, whereas indeed his Majesty did not wholly wave them, though as his occasions would not suffer him to return any answer at all to the Marquesses reply, so neither would they (it's likely) permit him to answer the former Paper so fully as otherwise he would have done. Whereas the Marquesse saith, that His Majesty is pleas'd to make recourse unto the Scriptures, This is surely the course that all ought to follow, that wil discusse matters of Religion, they ought to have recourse to the Scriptures, by which all such matters are to be tried and determined. *To the Law, and to the*

the testimony (saith the Prophet *Esay*) if they *speake not according to this word*, it is because there is no light in them. *Esay* 8. 20.

* *Augustine* speaking of the *Donatists*, bade let them shew their Church onely by the Canonickall bookes of the Scriptures, professing that he would not have any to beleeve that he was in the true Church, because of the commendation that *Optatus*, *Ambrose*, and many others did give of it. And againe, *Let us not heare* (saith he) *Thus say I, thus sayest thou, but let us heare, Thus saith the Lord.*— *Let those things be removed out of the way, which we alledge one against another, otherwise then from the Bookes of Canonickall Scripture.*— *I will not have the holy Church demonstrated by humane tokens, but by divine Oracles.* But saith the Marquesse.

* *Utrum ipsi Ecclesiam teneant, non nisi divinarum Scripturarum Canonicis libris ostendant: quia nec nos propterea dicimus nobis credi oportere, quod in Ecclesia Christi sumus, quia ipsam quam tenemus, commendavit Milevitanus Optatus, vel Mediolanensis Ambrosius, vel alii innumerabiles nostrae communionis Episcopi. Aug. de unit. Eccles. cap. 16. Non audiamus, Hæc dico, hæc dicis, sed audiamus, Hæc dicit Dominus.*— *Auferantur illa de medio, quæ adversus nos invicem non ex divinis Canonicis libris, sed aliunde recitamus.*— *Nolo humanis documentis, sed divinis oracula sanctam Ecclesiam demonstrari.* *Aug. ibid. cap. 3.*

What Heretick that ever was, did not do so? How shall the greatest Heretick in the World be confuted or censured, if any man may be permitted to appeale to Scriptures, margin'd with his own notes, sens'd with his owne meaning, and enlivened with his owne private spirit? to what end were those markes so fully, both by the Prophets, the Apostles, and our Saviour himselfe set down, if we make no use of them?

Ans. I. Though Hereticks make recourse unto Scripture, it follows not that therefore this is not the course which ought to be followed, or that therefore they are Hereticks that doe it. The Marquesse himselfe did make recourse unto Scripture in setting down the markes of the true Church, and so also doth he in handling sundry points in controversie betwixt Papists, and Protestants. This course therefore, himselfe being Judge, is not to be condemned: neither certainly is it, however Hereticks may abuse it. Though Hereticks will alledge Scripture in defence of their Heresies, yet are they nevertheless to be confuted by Scripture. The *Sadduces* thought by Scripture to overthrow the resurrection, yet by Scripture did our Saviour convince them. *Mat. 22. 23. 31.* Yea when the Devill himselfe did cite Scripture,

our Saviour did not therefore dislike it, but made use of it for the resisting of Satan, and the repelling of his temptation, *Mat. 4. 6, 7.*

2. It's true, none may appeal to Scriptures margin'd with their own Notes, sens'd with their own meaning, and enliven'd with their own private spirit. It's to no purpose to alledge Scripture, except that sense, in which it is alledged, may be made good by Scripture. The Jewish Rabbin (as Master *Selden* cites him) saith well, *All interpretation (of Scripture) which is not grounded upon the Scripture, is vaine.* But what this makes against his Majesties making recourse unto the Scriptures, or against any mans taking that course in disputes of this nature, I doe not see. For that his Majesty did so make recourse unto Scripture, the Marquesse doth not say, neither ought any man to be charged in this kind, except it can be proved that he is indeed guilty.

3. It doth not yet appear that the particulars before mentioned, viz. Universality, Antiquity, Visibilty, Succession of Pastours, Unity in Doctrine, and Conversion of Nations; that these (I say) were set down either by our Saviour, or his Apostles, or the Prophets, as marks of the True Church, at least so as to make any thing for the Marquesses purpose, viz. to prove the Church of Rome to be the True Church.

Your Majesty was pleased to urge the Errors of certain Fathers, to the prejudice of their Authority. Which I conceive would have been so, had they been all Montanists, Rebaptists, all Anthropomorphists, and all of them generally guilty of the faults, wherewith they were severally charged in the particulars: seeing that when we produce a Father, we doe not intend to produce a man in whose mouth was never found guile; the infallibility being never attributed by us otherwise then unto the Church, not unto particular Church men. As your Majesty hath most excellently observed in the sayings of the holy Apostles, who erred after they had received the Holy Ghost in so ample manner. But when they were all gathered together in Council, and could send about their Edicts with these Capitall Letters in the Front, *Visum est Spiritui Sancto, & nobis, Act. 15. 28.* then I hope your Majesty cannot say, that it was possible for them to Erre. So though the Fathers might erre in particulars; yet those particular Errors would be swallowed up in a Generall Council, &c.

Here the Marquesse grants, that the Fathers singly and severally

כל העתקה
שנין לה
סיוע מן
הכתוב
חיה בשלה
*Eliab Ben Moser
apud Selden: de
Anno Civili He-
braeorum, cap. 2.*

Marq: pag. 54.

Ans.

rally considered, may erre, but not if gathered together in a generall Councell. But first, doth not this invalidate the authority of the Fathers, when they are severally cited, as they are in this Reply frequently by the Marquesse? Indeed, here presently after he addes, *Neither is a particular defection in any man any exception against his testimony, except it be in the thing wherein he is deficient.* But certainly if a man be liable to errour in one thing, he is so in another thing; and therefore his bare testimony, except it have something to support it, is not sufficient to rely upon. *The testimony of the Lord is sure, saith David, Psal. 19. 7. because he can neither deceive, nor be deceived.* But man may, and therefore his testimony, as his, is not sure. No, *Let God be true, and every man a liar*, saith the Apostle, *Rom. 3. 4.*

2. For a generall Councell, why it should necessarily be exempt from Errour, I see nothing here alledged by the Marquesse, except it be, that *Acts. 15. 28. It seemed good to the holy Ghost, and to us.* But the inference made from that Councell, wherein the Apostles themselves did sit, and give sentence, to prove that no generall Councell can Erre, is no better than if one should argue, that a particular Father or Doctor is infallible, because a particular Apostle was so in that which he either wrote or preached. For we must take heed of entertaining such a thought (although the Marquesses words do seem to imply so much) as that each particular Apostle might fall into Errour, though all of them together could not. For how then should we be able to build our faith upon those Scriptures, which were composed by particular Apostles, and not by a whole Councell of them? It's true, (as his Majesty observed, pag. 50.) the Apostles were ignorant, and erronious in some things, but not in any thing that they delivered unto People to believe, and obey, either by word, or writing; for then (as I said) we could have no certainty of the Scriptures, we could not be built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, as Believers are, *Ephes. 2. 20.* But that generall Councils may erre, *Austin* made no question; * *Who knows not* (saith he) *that Provinciaall and Nationall Councils*

orum conciliorum auctoritati; quæ sunt ex universo orbe Christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere: ipsaq; plenaria sæpè priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat. Aug. de baptis. contra Donatist. lib. 5: cap. 3.

* Quis nesciat ipsa concilia, quæ per singulas regiones, vel provincias sunt, plenari-

doe yield to the authority of Generall Councils; and that Generall Councils are often attended, the former by the latter, that being after found out, which before lay hid? It is well known that the Romanists reject the authority of the Councils of Constance, and Basil, (two Generall Councils) when they determine the Pope to be inferiour, and subject to a Generall Council. Indeed, generally the Pontificians make little account of a Council, though otherwise never so generall, except it be confirmed by the Pope. Bellarmine makes it a clear case, and without all difficulty, that Generall Councils may erre, if the Fathers of the Council define any thing, when as the Legates of the Pope dissent from them: or if the Legates themselves do consent, but so as to go against the instructions which the Pope gave them. And he further holds, that in case the Legates had no certain instructions from the Pope, the Council may erre, and that before the Popes Confirmation of it, the judgment of a Generall Council is not infallible. The Marquesse himself (pag. 5. &c.) doth seeme to assent unto His Majesty, taxing Generall Councils for committing

Errors, but some passages he hath, which to me seeme very strange. If (saith he) we should suppose them to be Generall, and free Councils, yet they could not be Erroneous in any particular mans judgement, untill a like Generall Council should have concluded the former to be Erroneous. By this Assertion Arrianisme being confirmed by the Council of Ariminum, Athanasius, and every particular man should have assented to it, untill another Generall Council had determined against it; but this is such a position, as (I dare say) our Romish adversaries themselves will not allow. Again, If it should be granted (saith the Marquesse) that the Church had at any time determined amisse, the Church cannot be said to have erred, because you must not take the particular time for the Catholike Church, because the Church is as well Catholike for time, as territory; except you will make rectification an error. But when our adversaries of Rome speak of the Churches freedome from error, they understand it of the Church representative, a generall Council. *It is one, and the same thing, (saith Bellarmine)

Bellarmin. de
Concil. lib. 2.
cap. 11.

Ego existimo tale concilium
posse errare, neque esse infalli-
bile ejus judicium ante con-
firmationem Pontificis. Bel-
larm. ibid.

Pag. 56.

* Idem est ec-
clesiastium non
posse errare in
definitendis re-
bus fidei, & E-
piscopos non
posse errare; atqui singuli seorsim errare possunt: igitur congregati in unum errare non po-
terunt. Bellarm. de concil. l. 2. c. 2.

that

that the Church cannot erre in determining matters of faith, and that Bishops cannot erre. But severally they may erre, therefore being gathered together they shall be free from error. So then, if a Generall Council may erre at any one time, it is sufficient to overthrow their Tenet, that the Church cannot erre. That the Church (represented in a Generall Council) may after rectifie what before was amisse, and that also by the determination of a Generall Council, is so farre from proving, that the Church (as they take it) cannot Erre, that on the contrary it proves, that it may Erre. For though rectification be not error, yet it doth presuppose Error. Again, If I recall mine own words (saith the Marquesse) it is no Error, but an avoidance of Error. So where the same power Rectifies it self, though some things formerly have been Decreed amisse, yet that cannot render the Decrees of Generall Councils not binding, or incident to Error, quoad nos, though in themselves, & pro tempore, they may be so. I answer, it is without all doubt, that for one to recall his words, being Erronious, is no Error, but a correcting of Error, yet this doth clearly shew a man to be subject to Error. And so if the Church at one time in a Generall Council may Rectifie what at another time in a Generall Council it had Decreed amisse, it evidently appears, that the Church in a Generall Council may Erre. For otherwise, what need of Rectification were there, if there had been no Error? And certainly, if the Decrees of Generall Councils be Erronious (as the Marquesse denies not but they may be) they are not binding *Quoad nos*, we are not bound to assent unto them, but rather to dissent from them: For we are not bound to embrace Error, but to embrace Truth. *Prove all things, hold fast that which is good*, saith the Apostle, 1 Thes. 5. 21. By the Marquesses reason the Decree of the Council of Ariminum, confirming the Heresie of Arrius, should for the time have been binding; so that neither Athanasius, nor any other, should have presumed to oppose it, or to dissent from it, untill another Generall Council had declared against it.

Pag. 56.

As to your Majesties objecting the Errours of the Holy Apostles, and Pen-men of the Holy Ghost, and your inference thereupon, viz. that Truth is no where to be found but in holy Scripture: under your Majesties correction I take this to be the greatest argument against the private

private Spirit (urged by your Majesty) its leading us into all Truth, that could possibly be found out. For if such men (as they) indued with the Holy Ghost, innobled with the power of working Miracles, so sanctified in their callings, and inlightened in their understandings, could Erre: how can any man (lesse qualified) assume to himselfe a freedome from Erring, by the assistance of a private Spirit?

Ans. w.

1. His Majesty was farre from thinking, that the Apostles, as Pen-men of the Holy Ghost, could Erre. For then there were no room for that inference, *That Truth is no where to be found but in Holy Scripture.* 2. His Majesty spake not of any private Spirit, but of the Spirit of God leading us into all Truth, alledging that of the Apostle, *1 Cor. 2. 12. We have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given unto us of God.* It's true, if any underpretence of the Spirit goe contrary to the Word, (as too many doe) whether they be particular Persons, or generall Councells that doe so, it is a private Spirit, viz. their owne Spirit that they are guided by. Therefore Saint John bids, *Believe not every spirit, but trie the spirits, whether they be of God, because many false Prophets,* (many that falsly pretend the Spirit) *are gone out into the world,* *1 John 4. 1.* But whoever they be that goe according to the Word, though they be particular and private persons, yet it is not their own particular and private Spirit, but the Spirit of God that doth guide them. *The Scripture was given by inspiration of God,* *2 Tim. 3. 16.* Therefore it is Gods Spirit, and not Mans, that doth speak in, and by the Scriptures.

Marq. pag. 57.

Lastly, as to your Majesties quotation of so many Fathers, for the Scriptures easinesse, and plainnesse to be understand, If the Scriptures themselves doe tell us, that they are hard to be understood, &c.

Ans. w.

1. His Majesty did not quote many Fathers, nor any at all to prove that the Scriptures are every where plain, and easie to be understood, but to shew that the Scriptures are their own interpreters, which are His Majesties words, pag. 50. To prove this, (which is a most certain truth) His Majesty quoted indeed many Fathers, as *Irenaeus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Crystostome, Basil, Augustine, Gregory and Optatus.* The Scriptures quoted by the Marquesse make nothing against this, viz. *2 Pet. 3. 16. Ath. 8. 31.* (nor, as it is misprinted, *13.*) *Luke 24. 25.* (rather *45.*) *Apoc. 5. 4.* where

where, not the Angel, (as the Marquesse saith) but *John* wept, because none was found worthy to open, and to read the Book. Neither doth it appear, that by the Book there mentioned, is meant the Scripture, as the Marquesse seemeth to suppose. And so indeed many have thought, as the Jesuit *Ribera* telleth us, who yet neverthelesse professeth that he did not see how historically this could be. For this Book was shut and sealed (as he observes) untill that time that *John* had this Revelation, when as all the other Apostles were deceived: so that the Scripture (if it were the Book there spoken of) was alwayes shut to *Peter* and *Paul*, and the other Apostles. The other places (I grant) do shew that in the Scriptures there are some things obscure and difficult, at least to some; but this is nothing against the Scriptures being their own interpreters. What is obscure in one place, must be cleared by some other place; or else without extraordinary revelation I see not how we should attain to the understanding of it. No need therefore to put those sayings of the Fathers, cited by His Majesty, among the Errata's that are behind their Books, as the Marquesse speaketh, pag. 57. where he addes, *Or else we must look out some other meaning of their words than what your Maj: hath inferred from thence; as thus, they were easie in aliquibus locis, but not in omnibus locis: or thus, they were easie as to the attainment of particular salvation, but not as to the generall cognizance of all the Divine Myſtery therein contained, &c.* But this is nothing contrary to his Majesties inference, which was only this, *That the Scriptures are their own Interpreters, i. e. that Scripture is to be interpreted by Scripture, not that the Scriptures are clear in all points, and in all places; it sufficeth that (which the Marquesse himselfe doth seeme to yeild) they are clear in those things which concern Salvation: And this was Augustine's determination, In those things (saith he) which are plainly set down in the Scriptures, are found all those things, which concern faith, and good life. Yea, so much the Scripture doth testimony of it self, The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple, Psal. 19. 7. The entrance of thy words giveth light, it giveth understanding to the simple, Psal. 119. 130. From a child thou hast known the Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, &c. 2 Tim. 3. 15.*

R

At ego non video, quo modo historice liber, de quo loquitur Joannes, sit S. Scriptura. *Ribera in Apoc. 5. 1.*

In iis, quæ aperte posita sunt in Scripturâ, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moreq; vivendi. *Aug. de doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 9.*

First,

Marq.p.57,58.

First, We hold the real presence, you deny it; We say his Body is there, you say there is nothing but bare Bread: We have Scripture for it, Mat. 20. (for 26.) 26. Take eat, this is my Body. So Luke 22. 19. This is my Body which is given for you,

Answ.

Here the Marquesse comes to performe that which before he promised (pag. 53, & 54.) viz. to shew that in those points wherein they and we differ, the Scriptures are on their side, and not on ours: And he begins with the controversie about the presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, alledging those words, *This is my Body*, as a clear proof of their opinion, viz. that after Consecration there is no longer the substance of Bread, but that the Bread is transubstantiated, and turned into the substance of Christs Body. But doth it appear that those words, *This is my Body*, are to be understood properly any more than those, *Gen. 17. 10. This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee, every man-child among you shall be circumcised?* There Circumcision is called Gods Covenant, whereas properly it was not the Covenant it self, but the token of the Covenant, as it is called immediately after, ver. 11. So, *Exod. 12. 13.* and in other places the Lamb is called the Lords Pascheover, whereas properly it was not the Pascheover, but a Token of the Pascheover, being slain, and eaten in remembrance of the Lords passing over the houses of the *Israelites*, when he saw the First-born of the *Egyptians*, *Exod. 12. 13.* And thus also it's said, *1 Cor. 10. 4.* that *the Rock was Christ*. How could that be? Not in respect of Substance, but in respect of Signification; the Rock signified Christ, was a Type and a Figure of Christ. *Bel-larmine* (I know) doth endeavour to elude all these instances, as if the speeches were not Figurative, but Proper. To that place concerning Circumcision he answereth, that both Speeches are proper, viz. *Circumcision is the Covenant*, and *Circumcision is the Token of the Covenant*. Circumcision (he saith) was the Token of the Covenant, as the Covenant is taken for Gods Promise: and it was also the Covenant it self, as the Covenant is taken for the Instrument whereby the Promise is applyed. But here *Bel-larmine* is contrary both to himself, and to Reason. He is contrary to himselfe, for a little before he saith, that these words, *Circumcision is the Token of the Covenant*, *Gen. 17. 11.* are an Explan-

Bel. de Eu-
char. l. 1. c. 11.
Sect. Secundo
votarum est.

Ibid. Sect.
Quarto peccat.

cation

cation of that which went before, *ver. 10. viz. that Circumcision is the Covenant.* Now if the one be an Explication of the other, then needs must the word Covenant be taken alike in both. He is also contrary unto Reason, for it is absurd to say, that a Covenant doth properly signifie both a Promise, and also an Instrument, whereby the Promise is applyed. As well may one say, that Christs Body doth properly signifie both his Body, and also the Sacrament of his Body. A Covenant, in the very nature of it, being properly taken, doth signifie a Promise: and therefore the instrument, whereby it is applyed, cannot properly be the Covenant, but onely the Token, Pledge, and Assurance of it. It may as well be said, that a Covenant may have two diverse and distinct natures, as that a Covenant can be taken two diverse and distinct wayes, and yet be taken properly both the one way, and the other.

To those words, *It (viz. the Lamb) is the Lords passeover,* Exod. 12. 1. *Bellarmino* answers, that the Speech is not Figurative, but Proper. The Lamb he saith was properly the Lords Passeover: and mark his Reason, *Quia agnus immolabatur in memoriam illius transitus*; that is, *Because the Lamb was slain (or sacrificed) in memory of that passeover, or passing over.* Now what greater absurdity can there be, then this, which here *Bellarmino* doth fall into? He alledgeth that as a Reason of his assertion, which indeed doth quite overthrow it. For if the Lamb were slain, and sacrificed in memory of the Lords Passeover, or passing over, then was it not properly the Passeover it self, but only a Signe and Memoriall of it.

As for those words, *1 Cor. 10. 4. The Rock was Christ*; *Bellarmino* saith, that not a Materiall, but a Spirituall work is there meant; and that therefore, though the word *Rock* be taken Figuratively, yet the proposition it selfe, *The Spirituall Rock was Christ*, is not figuratively, but properly taken. But it is evident, that the Rock spoken of by the Apostle, was a materiall Rock, a Rock of Stone: For the Apostle speaketh of a Rock which the *Israelites* drank of; *They drank of that Rock*, saith he. Now that Rock which the *Israelites* drank of, was a materiall Rock, a Rock of Stone, as *Moses* doth shew, *Exod. 17. and Numb. 20.* *Austin* never questioned this to be the meaning of

Bellarmino. Ibid. Quadam citantur.

Bellarmino. ubi supra, Sect. II. lud etiam.

Quodammodo omnia significantia videntur earum rerum, quas significant, sustinere personas: sicut dictum est ab Apostolo, petra erat Christus, quoniam Petra illa, de qua hoc dictum est, significabat utique Christum. Aug. de civit. Dei lib. 18. cap. 48.

the Apostles words, *After a sort* (saith he.) *all things signifying, seeme to be instead of those things, which they signifie: as it is said by the Apostle, The Rocke was Christ, because that Rock, of which that is spoken, did indeed signifie Christ.*

These words of that learned Father are very remarkable, that onely for the understanding of that particular place of Scripture, but also for the determining of the maine Controversie betwixt us, and our Romane Adversaries. For he not onely saith, that the Rock is said to have been Christ, because it did signifie Christ, supposing and taking it as granted, that the Apostle spake of a materiall Rock; but also he saith, that after a sort all things signifying are instead of the things signified by them, and therefore are called by the same names. If our adversaries would minde this rule, they would soon see, that they have no cause to insist upon those words, *This is my Body*, and to urge the proper sense of them. But for these words, *The Rock was Christ*, Bellarmine argueth that a materiall Rock is not there meant, because the Apostle calleth it a *spirituall Rock*. I answer, so the Apostle there calleth Manna spirituall meat, yet was Manna a materiall thing, onely it had a spirituall signification. And so also was the Rock a materiall Rock, onely it's called spirituall for the same reason. Bellarmine objects, that a materiall Rock did not follow the Israelites, as the Apostle saith that the Rock did, which hee speakes of; *for they dranke* (saith he) *of that spirituall Rock that followed them*. I answer 1. The materiall Rock may be said to have followed them, that is, to have satisfied their desire of water. Thus (as Beza observes) * Photinus a

* συντρομέυει αὐτὸν τὸ βελήμαλι.
Photinus apud Occumen: though I confesse, he understands it of Christ as meant by the spirituall Rock there mentioned.

Greek Author doth expound it, and so also (as Pareus testifies) Lyra and Dionysius, two Romish expositors. Bellarmine notes Peter Martyr, as thus expounding it, neither hath he any thing against this exposition, but only that the Greek Fathers, and Erasmus interpret the word used by the Apostle *comitante*, i.e. accompanying. But this is nothing, for they might meane accompanying in a metaphoricall sense.

ense, viz. in respect of satisfying the desire. Again, the Rock may be said to have followed the *Israelites*, in that the water flowing forth of the Rock, did follow them. *Genebrard*, a great man of the Romish party, commenting upon those words, *Psal.* 78. 15. *He clave the Rocks in the Wilderness, &c.* saith that the Septuagint, and the vulgar Latine interpreter have it in the singular number, *Rock*, because by the Hebrew traditions there was but one Rock, which was smitten, and so sent forth water, at severall times, and in severall places: and that this Rock did remove with the *Israelites*, and follow them in their travells through the Wilderness. And this, he saith, is agreeable to that of the Apostle, *1 Cor.* 10. 4. But this is over Rabbinicall, and therefore he addes, that the Rock may be said to have followed the *Israelites*, that is, that the water which flowed out of the Rock did follow them, either in that they themselves by their own art, and industrie did derive and bring it to the place, where they camped; or that it was effected by Gods transmission and direction. *Bellarmino* objects, that a little after the *Israelites* did want water againe, as as we read *Num.* 20. and therefore the water did not follow them. But that want of water spoken of *Num.* 20. was not a little after, but a long time after the other mentioned *Exod.* 17. For that in *Exodus* was the *Israelites* camped in *Rephidim*, not long after they came out of *Egypt*; and the other was when they camped in *Kadesh*, in the fortieth yeare after they left *Egypt*, as is noted in the Hebrew Chronicle called *Seder Olam* cap. 9. Compare *Numbers.* 33. 14. with 36.

* *Genebrard* in the place before cited, meetes with this Objection, that *Bellarmino* makes, and answers, that according to the *Rabbins* both ancient, and moderne, that which is recorded *Num.* 20. is meant of the same Rock that is spoken of *Exod.* 17. the water whereof (they say) did faile because of *Miriam's* death (which happened there in *Kadesh*) untill upon the peoples

Nisi malis consecratam petram, id est, petrae fluxum, per derivationem, viz. & deductionem aquae à populo ad loca castrorum procuratam, five per ipsius Dei transmissionem & directionem. *Genebr.* loc. citat.

Paulo post indiguerunt rursus aqua. *Bell. ubi supra; Sest. Calvinus.*

* Nec obstat, quòd in deserto excitatum sit alterum murmur ob aquae penuriam, ut secundo educeretur aqua ex altera rupe post annos 38. Nam de hac ipsa rupe, nempe de priore hac *Rabbini* veteres, & recentiores intelligunt, cujus aquam tradunt defecisse propter *Mariae* mortem, donec secundo educeretur ex eadem ad secundum de aqua murmur, *Genebr. ubi supra.*

murmuring againe it was drawn out of the same Rock the second time.

This conceit of the *Rabbines* is far from pleasing me, onely I note how little force *Bellarmines* objection was of with his own copartner *Genebrard*. Indeed this is enough to shew the vanity of the objection, that (as *Genebrard* notes) the want of water in *Kadesh* was 38. years after that in *Rephidim*, and therefore was not (as *Bellarmino* sayes) a little after. But though it had not been one halfe quarter of that time before the *Israelites* wanted water againe, yer that is no argument why the Apostle speaking of the Rock that followed them, should not meane a materiall and visible Rock; for the materiall and visible Rock, that is, the water that flowed from it, might follow the *Israelites*, though but for while, even so long as they encamped in *Rephidim*: neither doth the Apostle say, that it followed them either perpetually, or for any long time, but onely that it followed them. But howsoever it be understood, that the Rock followed them (which I confesse is somewhat obscure) how by the Rock there should be meant Christ, as the efficient cause giving them water to drinke? For to drinke of the Rock, is there expressed in the same phrase, as to drinke of the Cup, 1 Cor. 11.28. Neither (I thinke) can one in any congruity be said to drinke of a man, that giveth him either water, or any thing else to drinke; but onely to drinke either of the liquour, or (metonymically) of that wherein the liquour is contained. Finally *Bellarmino* himselfe doth acknowledge, that the materiall Rock, which afforded the *Israelites* water to drinke, was a figure of Christ, and that the water proceeding from that Rock, was a figure of Christs Blood; onely he denies, that so much is meant by the Apostle in those words, *they drinke of the spirituall Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ*. But, I demand then, from what place of Scripture, if not from those words of the Apostle, can so much bee gathered?

ἐπὶ τὸν ἐκ πῆ-
τρας ἐκ τοῦ
πολλοῦ, πινέ-
τω.

Bell. ubi suprà,
Scilicet. est tamen.

*Est hic ponitur pro significare, quem-
admodum & ibi, Petra autem erat
Christus. *Iansen. concord. cap. 51.*

* *Jansenius* a learned Romanist, is more can-
did and free then *Bellarmino*; for expound-
ing the Parable of the sower he saith that the
word is (as when it is said, *The seed is the word*

of God, &c. Luke 8.11.) is put for *signifieth*, as also there where it is
said, *And the Rock was Christ.*

And

And so also, (say we) when 'tis said, *This is my Body*, the meaning is, *This doth signifie my Body*, or, *This is a Signe, a Token, a Seal, a Pledge of my Body*.

The Lord (saith (a) *Austine*) doubted not to say, *This is my Body*, When he gave the Signe of his Body. And again, speaking of those words, (b) *Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you.* Job. 6. 53, he saith, That *Christ* seemeth to command some hainous act, or some grosse wickedness: And that therefore it is a figurative speech, requiring us to communicate with the Lords sufferings, and sincerely and profusely to keep in memory that his flesh was Crucified, and wounded for us. And yet again, (c) *He that is at enmity with Christ* (saith he) *doth neither eat his Flesh, nor drink his Blood, although to the condemnation of his presumption, he daily receiveth the Sacrament of so great a thing, as well as others.*

(a) Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui. Aug. contra Adimant. cap. 12.

(b) Pacinus vel Flagitium videtur juberet. Figura ergo est, præcipiens passionibus Domini esse communicandum, & suaviter atque utiliter recondendum esse in memoria, quodd pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa, & vulnerata est. Aug. de doctr. Christi. lib. 3. cap. 16.

(c) Qui discordat à Christo, nec carnem ejus manducat, nec sanguinem bibis, etiam si tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium suæ præsumptionis quotidie indifferenter accipiat. Prosper in senem, ex Augustino, sent. 341.

These sayings of *Austine* doe sufficiently shew how he understood those words, *This is my Body*, and how far he was from being of the now-Romane Faith concerning the presence of Christ in the Sacrament. Indeed, these very words, *This is my Body*, which our Adversaries pretend to make so much for them, are most strong against them, and enough to throw down Transubstantiation. For Christ saying, *This is my Body*, what is meant by the word *This*? They of the Church of Rome cannot agree about it, but some say one thing, some another, only by no means they will have Bread to be meant by it. For they very well know that so their Transubstantiation were quite overthrowne. But look into the Scripture, and mind it well, and see if any thing else but Bread can be meant by the word *This*. It's said, *Mat. 26. 26. Jesus took Bread and blessed it, & brake it, and gave it to the Disciples, and said, Take, eat, This is my Body*. What is here meant by the word *This*? What is it that Christ calls his Body? That which he bade the Disciples take and eat. And what was that? That which he gave unto them. And what was that? That which he brake.

And

And what was that? That which he blessed. And what was that? That which he took. And what was that? Bread. For so expressly the Evangelist tells us, that *Jesus took Bread*. So then it was Bread that Christ took, and Bread that he blessed, and Bread that he brake, and Bread that he gave to the Disciples, and Bread that he bade them take and eat, and Bread of which he spake, saying, *This is my Body*. As if he should say, This Bread which I have taken, and blessed, and broken, and given unto you to eat, even this Bread is my Body. Now the word *This* relating unto Bread, the speech must needs be Figurative, and cannot be Proper. For properly Bread cannot be Christs Body, Bread and Christs Body, being things of diverse and different natures; and so it being impossible that properly one should be the other. As when Christ called *Herod* a Fox, and the *Pharisees* Serpents and Vipers, the speeches are not Proper, but Figurative; so is it when he called Bread his Body, it being no more possible that Bread should be the Body of Christ in propriety of speech, then that a man should properly be a Fox, a Serpent, a Viper. Besides, doth not the Apostle, *1 Cor. 11.* speaking of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, continually call it Bread, even after Consecration? Indeed, to distinguish it from ordinary and common Bread, he calls it *This Bread*; but yet still Bread, the same in substance, though not the same in use, as before. And (which is worthy to be observed) thus the Apostle calls it, *viz. Bread*, when he sharply reproves the *Corinthians* for their unworthy receiving of the Sacrament, setting before them the grievousness of the sin, and the greatness of the danger that they did incur by it. Now what had been more forcible and effectual to this end, than for the Apostle, if he had been of the Romish Faith, to have told them, that now it was not Bread, though it seemed unto them to be so, but that the substance of the Bread was gone, and instead thereof was come the very substance of Christs Body? He saith indeed, That *who so eat that Bread, and drink the Cup of the Lord unworthily, are guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*: But that is, because that Bread, and that Cup, (*i.e.* the Wine in the Cup) are by the Lords own institution Signes and Seales of the Lords Body and Blood; so that the unworthy receiving of them is an indignity done to the things signified by them. But to return to the

Marquette,

Disparatum de
disparato non
potest univocè
prædicari.

Marquesse, he citeth sundry passages in *John 6.* where our Saviour speakes of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, calling himselfe *Bread, living Bread,* and affirming that *his Flesh is meat indeed, and his Blood drinke indeed.* But all this is farre from proving that reall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, which the Marquesse doth contend for. For, 1. as *Janſenius* (not to name other of the Marquesse's own party) hath unanswerably proved, Christ in *John 6.* did not treat of the Sacrament, but onely of the spirituall eating of his Flesh, and the spirituall drinking of his Blood by faith. 2. The words of our Saviour *John 6.* if they must prove any transubstantiation at all, will sooner prove the transubstantiation of Christs body into Bread, then the transubstantiation of Bread into Christs body. *I am the Bread of life,* saith he, *John 6.35. & 48. I am the living Bread, &c. ver. 51. My flesh is meat indeed, &c. ver. 55.* If these sayings bee taken properly, and without a figure, they will prove a conversion, not of Bread into the body of Christ, but of the Body of Christ into Bread. And the argument that

Janſen. Concord. cap. 59.

* *Bradwardine* useth against the Idols of the Pagans, is-by full proportion of as much force against our adversaries transubstantiation. Perhaps (saith he) it is answered, that a materiall Idoll after consecration rightly performed, is transubstantiated and turned into God.—*This conversion (viz. of the Idoll into God) is refuted, because it appears to every sense, all experience bearing witness, that there is the same materiall Idoll that was before. Therefore if there be any conversion made, it seemes rather that God is converted into the Idoll, then that the Idoll is converted into God.* This argument, I say, doth as strongly militate against the opinion of the Romanists concerning the reall presence. For it no lesse appears, to every sense, all experience bearing witness, that there's the same materiall Bread that was before. Therefore if there be any conversion made, it seemes rather that Christs Body is converted into the Bread, then that the Bread is converted into Christs Body.

* Forſitan responderetur quòd idolum materiale poſt conſecrationem rite factam totum tranſubſtantiatuſ convertiturque in Deum.—Hæc converſio reſellitur, quia videtur cuilibet ſenſui, omni experimento teſtante, quòd ibi ſit idem idolum materiale quod prius. Quare ſi aliqua converſio ibi fiat, magis videtur Deum converti in idolum, quàm è contrà. *Bradward : de cauſâ Dei l. 1. c. 1.*

Page 58.

The Marquesse saith that we with the *Jewes* and *Infidels* say, *How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* *Joh. 6. 52.* But we say no such thing. How should wee, if wee believe Christ saying, *except yee eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drinke his Blood, you have no life in you.* *vers. 53.* We know and acknowledge, that we must eat the flesh of Christ, but yet spiritually, not (as those unbelieving *Jewes* imagined, being therein more like unto our Adversaries) carnally. For so our Adversaries hold, that the wicked may eat the flesh of Christ, and yet be never the better, but receive it to their condemnation: whereas the eating of Christs Flesh spoken of *Joh. 6.* is a thing that doth accompany salvation. † *Who so eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, hath eternall life, &c. v. 54.*

† See *Iansen*. up-
on those words,
Concord. cap.
59.

Page 58.

But saith the Marquesse, *Had this been but a figure, certainly Christ would have removed the doubt, when he saw them so offended at the reality.* *Joh. 6. 61.* He would not have confirmed his saying in terminis, with promise of a greater wonder, *Joh. 6. 62.* You may as well deny his Incarnation, his Ascension, and aske, *How could the man come down from Heaven, and goe up againe?*

Answer, 1. A figure, viz. in speech, is not properly opposed to reality, but to propriety. The Spirituall eating of Christs Flesh, is a reall, yet not a proper, but a figurative, a metaphoricall eating of it: when Christ saith, *I am the true Vine*, *Joh. 15. 1.* there is a reality implied, as well as when he saith, *My flesh is meate indeed*, *Joh. 6. 55.* yet no Romanist (I presume) but will grant, that Christ is a Vine, not properly, but figuratively so called. *True Vine*, that is, excellent, incorruptible and spirituall Vine, as * *Jansenius* out of *Euthymius* doth expound it. So *meate indeed*, that is, excellent, incomparable and spirituall meate.

* *Vitis vera*,
id est, eximia,
incorruptibi-

lis, & spiritualis. Iansen. ex Euthymio Concord. cap. 135.

2. For those words of our Saviour, *John 6. 62.* *What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* they make nothing for our Adversaries, but rather against them. For our Saviour in those words most probably intended to let the Jewes see, that he did not speak of a Carnall eating of his Flesh, as they

they supposed, but of a Spirituall eating of it. So *Austine* understood those words, as *Janſenius* notes, and judgeth that exposition most probable. And so the Jesuite *Mal-donate*, who cites *Beda* and *Rupertus* as following the same exposition, confesseth that exposition more probable than any other that he met with. Yea, that he had no Author of that Interpretation which he embraced, viz. *What Will ye doe when ye shall see me ascend into Heaven? How much more then Will ye be offended? How much lesse will ye then believe?* Yet he saith that he did approve this rather then that of *Austine*, though of all the rest most probable, because this did more oppose the sense of the Calvinists, which to him (he saith) was a great argument of the probability of it. Here see, and observe the disposition of a Jesuit, what little reckoning he made of Fathers, so he might but oppose Calvinists. *Bellarmino* also thinks this a very literall exposition, that Christs meaning was to shew that they should have greater cause to doubt after his Ascension then they had before. And this exposition he saith seems to be *Chrysostomes*; yet *Janſenius* attributeth another exposition unto *Chrysostome*, and *Maldonate* confesseth that he found none to expound it in that manner. Neither is this exposition agreeable to the letter. For it is equally conceiveable, that Christ being on Earth, should give his Flesh to many thousands to eat; if it be meant of Carnall eating, as that he should doe it being in Heaven. But *Bellarmino* first hath another exposition of those words of our Saviour, which here the Marquesse seemeth to follow, viz. that our Saviour would confirme one wonderfull thing by another no lesse wonderfull; if not more, he means the wonderfull eating of his Flesh (in their sense) by his wonderfull Ascension into Heaven. And this exposition, he saith, doth confirm their opinion; for that, if Christ had not promised to give his true Flesh in the Sacrament, he needed not to prove his power by his Ascension. I answer, it doth argue an extraordinary power in Christ to give his Flesh to eat, though there be no turning of the substance of the Bread in the Sacrament into the substance of his Flesh. *Bellarmino* indeed saith, it

Janſen. Concord. cap. 59.

Non nego me hujus interpretationis authorem habere neminem (scil. Quid facietis cum videritis me ascendentem in coelum? quanto magis scandalizabimini? quanto minus credetis?) sed hanc eo magis probo, quam illam alteram Augustini, cæterarum alioqui probabilissimam, quod hæc cum Calvinistarum sensu magis pugnet, quod mihi magnum est probabilitatis argumentum. *Maldon. ad Joh. 6. 62.*

Bell. de Euchar. lib. 1. cap. 6.

Bell. Ibid.

Bell. Ibid.

is no miracle (such as the Jewes required of Christ, *Job: 6.30.31.*) that common Bread should signifie Christs Body, or that Christs Body should be eaten by Faith. But is this so ordinary and easie a matter, that common Bread (common for substance, though not for use) should so signifie the Body of Christ, that by the due receiving of it, the very Body of Christ should be received, and so Christ and the Receiver be united together Spiritually, even as Bread, and he that eateth it, are united together Corporally? Is all this nothing, except the Bread be substantially changed and turned into Christs Body? Why then doth *Bellarmino* elsewhere tell us, that the Fathers refer the wonderful effects of Baptisme (for of that Sacrament particularly doe almost all the Fathers speak, which are cited by him) to Gods Almighty power? I am sure *Bellarmino* would not have us believe for all this, that the substance of the water in Baptisme is changed into any other substance.

*Bell. de effect.
Sacram. l. 2. c. 7.
Sect. Calvinus.*

Page 58, 59.

Where our Saviour tells them (saith the Marquette) thus to argue according to flesh and blood in these words, *I be flesh profiteeth nothing, and that if they will be entrained in their understanding, they must have Faith to believe it in these words, It is the Spirit that quickneth, John 6. 63. They pervert our Saviours meaning into a contrary sense of their own imagination, viz. The flesh profiteeth nothing, that is to say, Christs Body is not in the Sacrament: but it is the Spirit that quickneth, that is to say, we must onely believe that Christ dyed for us, but not that his Body is there. As if there were any need of so many inculcations, pressures, offences, misbelievings of, and in a thing that were no more but a bare memoriall of a thing, being a thing nothing more usuall with the Israelites, as the 12. stones which were erected as a signe of the children of Israels passing over Jordan, &c. Josh. 4.*

Ans.

Those words of our Saviour, *The Flesh profiteeth nothing, It is the Spirit that quickneth,* make also rather against our Adversaries opinion, than for it. For as *Jansenius* comments upon them, our Saviour in those words signifies, *That his flesh is to be eaten in spiritual manner, and not carnally: which is that which we hold and maintain against them of the Church of Rome.*

Significat modum, quo caro ejus esse edenda, spirituale esse, & spiritu edendam esse, non carnaliter. *Jansen. Concord. cap. 59.*

This

This exposition (as the same *Janse-*
nius observes) doth both answer the mur-
 muring of the Jewes, and also agree with
 the sentence following, *The words which I*
have spoken unto you, they are spirit, and they
are life, that is, they are spiritual, and to be
 understood spiritually, and so they give life
 to those that hear them. Thus (he saith) *An-*
sime doth interpret this sentence; and a little before he cites
Chrysostome, *Theophylact*, and others, as understanding Christs
 words in this sense. 2. To remove those offences, and mis-be-
 leevings which the Jewes had about the eating of Christs Flesh,
 which he spake of (they understanding his words in a carnall
 sense) there was need enough of so many inculcations and pres-
 sures, for we see, that after all those inculcations and pressures
 yet our Adversaries will not be taken off from the like Carnall
 conceit, as the offended and mis-beleeving Jewes had. Our Ad-
 versaries would seeme indeed to be far from compliance with
 those Jewes, because they doe not hold that Christs Flesh is to
 be eaten by bits, so as to be divided one piece from another (as
 those Jewes seeme to have imagined) but that it is to be eaten,
 though corporally, yet in an invisible, and indivisible manner.
 But Pope *Nicolas* caused *Berengarius* to re-
 cant his opinion, and to confesse, *That not*
only the Sacrament of Christs Body, but the
very body it selfe is sensually held in the Priests
hands, and torne by the Teeth of the Faith-
full. Which expressions are as harsh as our
 Adversaries can use; when they would set
 forth the grossnesse of that conceit which
 the Jewes had about eating Christs Flesh.

And indeed so harsh are those expressions in *Berengarius* his
 recantation prescribed by the Pope, that the Glosse upon it is
 forced to say, *Except you rightly under-*
stand the words of Berengarius, (hee might
 have said of Pope *Nicolas*, who did pre-
 scribe them) *you will fall into a greater*
Heresie, then he was in. And therefore you

Et scit hæc explicatio optimè respon-
 det murmurantium verbis, ita & se-
 quenti sententiæ congruit, Verba quæ
 locutus sum vobis, spiritus & vita sunt,
 hoc est, sunt spiritualia, & spiritualiter
 intelligenda, ac sic auditori conferunt
 vitam. Sic enim hanc sententiam eti-
 am Augustinus enarrat. *Janse. Ibid.*

Ore & corde confiteor, &c. panem &
 vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post
 consecrationem non solum Sacramen-
 tum, sed etiam verum corpus & san-
 guinem D. N. Jesu Christi esse, &
 sensualiter non solum sacramentum,
 sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum
 tractari, frangi, fidelium dentibus at-
 tæri. *De Consecr. dist. 2. cap. Ego Berengar.*

Nisi sanè intelligas verba *Berengarii*,
 in majorem incidēs hærēsin, quàm
 ipse habuit: & idē omnia referas ad
 species ipsas: nam de Christi cor-
 pore partes non facimus, *Gloss.*

must referre all to the species (or shewes) themselves ; for we doe not make any parts of *Christs Body*. So then to free themselves from a Capernaiticall manner of eating Christs Flesh, our adversaries hold, that neither Christs body, nor bread, but onely the species, or shewes of bread, as quantity, colour, savour, and the like, meere accidents without a substance, are torne with the teeth, divided and broken. And is this properly to eate Christs Body ? or is not this eating of Christs Flesh as imaginable as that of the Jewes ? whereas the Marqueffe speaketh of a bare memoriall ; 1. Christ himselfe hath plainly taught us, that the Sacrament is a memoriall of him, saying, *Doe this in remembrance of me.* 2. We doe not say, that Christ is barely remembred in the Sacrament, but so remembred ; as also to be received, viz. by such as have faith whereby to receive him. For to receive Christ, is to believe in him, as is cleare *Joh. 1. 12.* So that this receiving of Christ, though it be a reall, yet it is not a corporall, but a spirituall receiving of him.

Page 67.

After the Scriptures, the Marqueffe cites some Fathers, as *Ignatius Epist. ad Smyr. Justine Apol. 2. Cyprian Ser. 4. de Laps. Ambros. 1. 4. de Sacram. and Remigius* (the place where not noted) who (he saith) affirme the flesh of Christ to be in the Sacrament, and the same flesh, which the Word of God tooke in the Virgins Wombe.

Ans. The question is not whether Christs Flesh be in the Sacrament, but how it is in it, concerning which these Fathers, so farre as the Marqueffe doth shew, speake nothing : To say, that they speake of the same flesh, which the Word of God tooke in the Wombe of the Virgin, is onely to shew that they speake of Christs flesh properly so called, but it doth not shew that they speake of that flesh being properly in the Sacrament. I know no flesh of Christ properly so called, but that, which the Word made Flesh (*Joh. 1. 14*) tooke of the Virgin Mary : but though it be granted (as it is) that this flesh of Christ is in the Sacrament, yet still the question remaines whether this flesh of Christ be properly, substantially, and corporally in the Sacrament, viz. under the species, or shewes of bread, as our Adversaries hold ; and to this question the Marqueffe doth not say that the Fathers alledged by him, doe speake any thing : and therefore I

might

might well let them passe without any further answer.

But to consider them, and their testimonies more particularly. First, *Ignatius* his words (as they are cited by *Bellarmino*) are to this effect, *They* (meaning certaine Hereticks) *doe not admit Eucharists, and oblations, because they doe not confesse the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour, which did suffer for our sins,* *Bell. de Euchar. l. 2. c. 2.* *and which the Father of his goodnesse did raise up.* This testimony is nothing against us, who doe not deny the Eucharist, that is, the bread in the Eucharist to be the flesh of Christ, onely wee say that it is not his flesh in a proper, but in a figurative sense, viz. (as *Austine* in the words before cited observes) the thing signifying being called by the name of the thing signified. And this must be the meaning of *Ignatius*; for hee speakes, not of Christs flesh being in the Eucharist, but of the Eucharist being Christs Flesh. Whereby the Eucharist can be meant nothing but the Sacramentall bread, and that (as I have before demonstrated) by the confession of all cannot properly, but onely figuratively be Christs Flesh. *Bellarmino* objects, that the Hereticks spoken of by *Ignatius*, denied Christ to have true flesh, holding that he was but seemingly borne, crucified, and raised againe. And therefore (hee saith) they did not deny the Eucharist to signifie the flesh of Christ, but onely to be the Flesh of Christ, lest they should be forced to admit that Christ had true flesh. But (say I) how could those Hereticks yeeld that Eucharist doth signifie the flesh of Christ, and yet deny that Christ hath flesh? For a thing must needs first be, before there can be truly any signification of it. Men (saith *Bellarmino*) may paint bodies, which indeed are not. But who will say that these Pictures are representations of bodies, and not meere Pictures? And this is all that *Bellarmino* could make out of *Ignatius*. The next Father is * *Iustine Martyr*, who saith that *the Bread in the Sacrament, is not common Bread, nor the Cup a common Cup.* We say the same, they are not common, being sanctified, and set apart for a holy use. But doth this prove any transubstantiation? our adversaries hold no substantiall change of the water in Baptisme

* ἡ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον, οὕτως κοινὸν ποῦμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν. *Iustin. Apol. 2.*

tisme, and yet they will not say, that it is common water; I am sure it is farre more justly to be accounted Holy, than that which they use to call *Holy Water*.

Iustine also saith, That we are taught, that the food in the Eucharist, by which being changed, our flesh and blood is nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Iesus that was incarnate. But this was so far from proving Transubstantiation, that indeed it overthrowes it: For in saying that we are nourished by the food, the Bread and the Wine in the Sacrament, he

saith in effect that the substance of that food, that Bread and Wine, doth still remaine; for otherwise how should we be nourished by it? Christs Body and Blood are not for our corporall nourishment, of which *Iustine* speaketh; neither can the bare *Species*, or shewes of Bread and Wine afford any such nourishment.

Bell. de Euchar.
l. 2. c. 4.

But (saith *Bellarmino*) *Iustine* writing an Apology for Christians, and their Religion, was a prevaricator, and made the Christian Faith most odious, by expressing himself so as he did, whereas he might have avoided all superstition, if he had believed that Christ is not so in the Sacrament, as that the Bread is substantially changed, and turned into his Body. I answer, that *Iustines* expressions are agreeable to our Saviours: 1. *This is my Body*, and therefore no more apt to render the Faith of Christians odious than the other. Neither was it much to be feared, that the Heathens, to whom he wrote his Apology, should not be able to understand the Figure, whereby the signe is called that which it signifieth; there was no need (as *Bellarmino* scoffingly speaks) that for the understanding of this Figure they should be conversant in the School of the Calvinists.

Opinatur fortasse Petrus Martyr Imperatorem illum versatum fuisse in Scholâ Calvinistarum, ut statim ad tropos omnia revocaret. *Bellar. Ibid.*

The next Father cited by the Marquess is *Cyprian*, who speaking of some, that in time of Persecution denied the Faith, and yet presumed to receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; to let them see the hainousnesse of their presumption, he first alledged some places of Scripture, as *Levit.* 7. 19, 20. and *1 Cor.* 10. 21. and

11. 27. And then he addes, *All these things being despised and contemned, violence is offered to Christs Body and Bloud; and they now sinne against the Lord more by their hands and mouth, then they did before when that they denyed him.* But what is there in all this to shew

Cyprian held any such presence of Christ in the Sacrament, as they of the Romish Church maintaine? Yes (saith *Bellarmino*, for the Marquesse onely points at places, but cites no words, much lesse drawes any argument from them) *Cyprian* did certainly beleve Christ to be so in the Sacrament, or else he would never have so aggravated the unworthy receiving of the Sacrament, as to make it a greater sinne than to deny Christ before a persecutor. But this reason is over-weak. For first, *Cyprian* being very Rhetoricall, might a little hyperbolize in his expression. And 2. without any Hyperbole at all the words may be made good, and yet no Transubstantiation, nor any corporall presence of Christ in the Sacrament be supposed. For the sin of denying Christ under Persecution might be (and most probably was) of infirmity; and the sinne of receiving the Sacrament unworthily might be of presumption, and so more hainous in that respect than the other. In the same place *Cyprian* also relates some miraculous punishments which were inflicted on some that unworthily received the Sacrament: and hence also *Bellarmino* infers that Christ is corporally present in the Sacrament, for that we doe not read (he sayes) of any such miracles shewed upon those who have unworthily medled with other Signes. I answer, yes, we doe; we read of *Nadab* and *Abihu* slain with fire from Heaven, for offering Incense with strange Fire, *Levit. 10.* and yet that Incense, and the Altar on which it was offered, were but Types and Figures. So the Arke was but a Signe of Gods Presence, and yet many thousands of the *Bethshemites* were destroyed for looking into it, *1 Sam. 6.4.* so also was *Uzza* for presuming to touch it, *2 Sam. 6.*

Next to *Cyprian*, the Marquesse cites, *Ambrose Lib. 4. de Sacram.* but no Chapter is cited by him. *Bellarmino* cites Chap. 3, 4, and 5. Now all that *Ambrose* saith, chap. 3. as look-
Christianorum quam Judeorum, & diviniore esse Sacramenta. *Ambros. de Sacram. lib. 4. cap. 3.*

Spretis his omnibus, atque contemptis vis inferetur corpori ejus, & sanguini; & plus modò in Dominum manibus atque ore delinquant, quàm cum Dominum negaverunt. *Cypr. de Laps.*

Bell. de Euchar. lib. 2. cap. 9.

Bell. Ibid.

Accipe que dico, anteriora esse mysteria

ing that way, is but this, That the Sacraments of Christians are more Divine then those of the Jewes. Which we grant, not in respect of the thing signified, For Jesus Christ yesterday, and to day, and the same for ever, Heb. 13. the same Christ was signified by the Jewish Sacraments as by ours: but in respect of the manner of signifying, Christ being more clearly signified by our Sacraments, than he was by those which the Jewes had. See 2 Cor. 3. 12. &c.

Sed panis iste, panis est ante verba Sacramentorum; ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi. Ambros. de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4.

But chap. 4. Ambrose hath something that may seem to make more against us, viz. That before Consecration it is Bread, but when Consecration cometh, then of Bread it is made the Flesh of Christ.

To this I answer, that these words doe not inferre any Transubstantiation. By Consecration, of Bread is made Christs Flesh, but Sacramentally, not Substantially; Figuratively, not Properly. And that Ambrose in those words did intend no substantiall

Si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent esse, quæ non erant; quanto magis operatius est, ut sint quæ erant, & in aliud commutentur? Ambros. Ibid.

change of the Bread, appears by his owne words in the same Chapter. If (saith he) there was such force in the speech of the Lord Jesus, that things should begin to be that were not: how much more operative is it, that those

things should be, which were, and should wishall be changed into another thing? Therefore in the judgement of Ambrose, the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, are what they were, viz. in respect of substance, yet by vertue of Christs institution are changed, viz. in respect of signification.

Rel. ubi supra.

Bellarmino, to evade this testimony, first sayes, that Lanfrancus in his book against Berengarius speaks of some Copies of Ambroses his Workes, wherein those words were not, *Ut sint quæ erant*, that is, *That those things should be which were*. But no such Copies either Printed, or Manuscript, it seems did Bellarmino meet with; for otherwise (I doubt not) he would have given us notice of them. Again, with the same Lanfrancus he answers, that those words are thus to be understood, that in respect of outward shew, the things which were, still are, but are changed in respect of inward substance. But how can a thing be said to be what it was, when as there is no substance of the thing remaining, but onely a shew and appearance of it? In the last place Bellarmino

addes

addes of his own, that *Ambrose* meant, If Christ could make a thing of nothing, why can he not make a thing of something, not by annihilating the thing, but by changing it into that which is better? But if a thing be changed substantially into another thing, how doth it remain what it was before? But so the things doe, that *Ambrose* speaks of. For *Bellarmines* criticisme is poor in distinguishing betwixt, *Ut sint id, quod erant*, That they should be that which they were, and *Ut sint quae erant*, That the things should be that were, as if these words did not import that the same substances still remain, as well as the other when Christ turned Water into Wine, can we say, that his Word was operative, and powerfull, *Ut esses quod eras, & in aliud mutaremur*, That that should be which was, and that withall, it should be changed into another thing? I confesse I cannot see how the thing may be said truly and properly to be, which was, if it be substantially changed into some other thing. *Ambrose* there a little after saith, *Tu ipse eras, sed eras vetus creatura: postquam consecratus es, nova creatura esse coepisti*. Thou thy self wast, but thou wast an old creature: after thou art consecrated, thou beginnest to be a new creature: which cannot be meant of any substantiall change in us. Chap. 5. the same *Ambrose*; (if it were *Ambrose*, for *Bellarmino* is not very confident that *Ambrose* was the Author of those Books, *De Sacramentis*) saith indeed, That before it is Consecrated, it is Bread, but when the words of Christ are come, it is the Body of Christ. But that it is so the Body of Christ, as to be no longer Bread he doth not affirme. That he was of another mind, appears by the words before alledged. And so much also may be gathered from that which he saith in this same Chapter, *viz. He that did eat Manna, dyed: but whose eateth this Body, shall have remission of sins, and shall live for ever*. Which cannot be understood of a Corporall eating of Christs Body, but of a Spirituall eating of it. *Bellarmino* cites some other sayings of *Ambrose* out of another Work of his, *viz. Deus, qui mysteris initiatur*, but they prove no more than these already cited, neither doth the *Marquise* refer us to them. Yea, in that same work *Ambrose* doth sufficiently declare himselfe

Antequam consecratur, panis est: ubi autem verba Christi accesserint, corpus est Christi. *Ambr. de Sacr. l. 4. c. 5.*

Manna qui manducavit, mortuus est; qui manducaverit hoc corpus, fiet ei remissio peccatorum, & non morietur in æternum. *Ambr. Ibid.*

Verè ergo carnis illius Sacramentum est. — post consecrationem corpus significatur. *Ambros. de iis qui myster. inis. cap. 6.*

Non erga corporalis esca, sed spiritualis est. Unde & Apostolus de typo ejus ait, Quia patres nostri escam spiritualem manducaverunt, & potum spiritualem biberunt. *Ibid.*

against Transubstantiation. For there he saith, *It is truly the Sacrament of Christs Flesh.* And, after Consecration, the Body (of Christ) is signified. And again, *It is not therefore Corporall food, but Spirituall.* Whence also the Apostle saith of the Type of it, that our Fathers did eat Spirituall meat, and did drink Spirituall drink, 1 Cor. 10. The last Author *Remigius*, is onely cited by the Marquesse at

large, neither doe I find him cited by *Bellarmino* at all, and therefore untill we have some particular place cited out of him, it is in vain to trouble our selves about him; besides, that his Antiquity is not such, as that his Authority should much be stood upon, being 890 years after Christ, as *Bellarmino* sheweth in his book of Ecclesiasticall Writers.

Page 59,
& 60.

Secondly, (saith the Marquesse) *We hold that there is in the Church an infallible Rule for understanding of Scripture, besides the Scripture it self. This you deny, this we have Scripture for, as Rom. 12. 6. We must prophesy according to the Rule of Faith. We are bid to walke according to this Rule, Gal. 6. 16. We must encrease our Faith, and preach the Gospel according to this Rule, 2 Cor. 10. 15. This rule of Faith the Holy Scriptures call a forme of Doctrine, Rom. 6. 17. a thing made ready to our hands, 2 Cor. 10. 16. that we may not measure our selves by our selves, 2 Cor. 10. 12. the depositions committed to the Churches trust, 1 Tim. 6. 20. for avoiding of profane and vaine babblings, and oppositions of sciences, And by this rule of faith is not meant the Holy Scriptures; for that cannot doe it, as the Apostle tells us, whilst there are unstable men, who wrest this way and that way to their own destruction; but it is the tradition of the Church, as it is delivered from hand to hand, as most plainly appears, 2 Tim. 2. 2. The things which thou hast heard of us (not received in writing from me or others) among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithfull men, who shall be able to teach it to others also.*

Answer.

That there is any infallible Rule for understanding of Scripture, or any other rule of Faith, besides the Scripture, we do deny, and that by authority of the Scripture it self. *To the law, and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this Word, it is because they have*

no light in them. Ifai. 8. 20. Search the Scriptures, for in them yee thinke to have eternall life, and they are they that testifie of mee. Joh. 5. 39. These were more noble then they of Thessalonica, in that they received the Word With all readinesse of minde, and searched the Scriptures, whether those things were so. Acts 17. 11. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproofe, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good workes, 2 Tim. 3. 16. 17. Neither doe those places alledged by the Marquesse make for the contrary.

We must prophesie according to the rule of Faith, saith the Apostle Rom. 12. 6. as the Marquesse hath it, following therein the Rhemists translation, as also their comment upon the place. But the word in the originall signifies rather *proportion*, then *rule*. And I see not but that by the proportion of faith may be understood the measure of faith, which is spoken of vers. 3.

But be it granted, that proportion of faith is as much as rule of faith, where doth the Apostle say, that this rule of faith is any other then the Scripture it selfe? The places before cited shew, that we are referred to the Scripture, as the rule, whereby all doctrines are to be tried; but no where doe I finde, that wee are referred to any unwritten tradition. Sure I am our Adversaries can evince no such thing from the words of the Apostle, Rom. 12. 6. Except we must (to use the Marquesses expressions) take them *margin'd With their own notes, sens'd with their own meaning, and enlivened with their own private spirit.* As for the rule mentioned, Gal. 6. 16. it is no generall rule of faith, or of interpreting Scripture, but a speciall rule, that in Christ Iesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature; as is cleare by the context, ver. 15. *As many as walke according to this rule, that is, (as * Oecumenius expounds it) as many as are content with this rule, and this doctrine, that all things are made a new creature, and doe not subject themselves to the Law.* Neither is the place, 2 Cor. 10. 15. to the purpose. For the Apostle there speaks of a rule by

ἀναλογία.

Page 53.

* ὅσοι φησιν, τὸ κατὰ τὴν τέτταρην καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ταύτῃ ἀρκεῖσθαι, τὸ κατὰ τὴν κλίσιν εἶναι τὰ πάντα, καὶ μὴ ὑποβάσκειν αὐτοὺς τὸ νόμον. Oecum. ad loc.

* Loquitur Paulus ad similitudinem
filiorum, quibus artifices utantur pro
regulis operum efficiendorum. Ar-
chimagister siquidem prædens uni-
verso operi fabricæ, vel colendæ
terræ, vel efficiendorum aggerum, filiis
(quæ regulæ vocantur) distinguit
partes operis, & juxta regulam cuique
datam mensura est operis cuiusque.
Hæc metaphorâ utitur Paulus, ad sig-
nificandum quod materia gloriati-
onis suæ est mensurarum terrarum
spatium, in quo hactenus prædica-
verat secundum regulam, non à se-
ipso, non ab apostolis, sed à Deo;
quod terrarum spatium perungebat
usque ad Corinthios. *Cajetan. in 2.*
Cor. 10.

way of similitude (as Cardinall * *Cajetan*
doth well expound it) viz. that as an Ar-
chitect, or the like chiefe workman, doth
by rule divide the worke that is to be done,
and appoint under-workemen where they
shall imploy themselves, and how farre
they shall reach: so God did as it were by
rule appoint *Paul*, where he should preach
the Gospell, and how farre his imployment
should extend in that kinde. This plainly
appears to be the Apostles meaning by the
two verses immediately preceding, *But we*
will not boast of things without our measure, but
according to the measure of the rule, which God
both distributed unto us, a measure to reach
even unto you. For we stretch not our selves be-

yond our measure, as though wee reached not unto you; for we are
come as farre as you also in preaching the Gospell of Christ. Then
he addes, Not boasting of things without our measure, that is, of
other mens labours, but having hope, when your faith is increased,
that we shall be enlarged by you, according to our rule abundantly,
To preach the Gospell in the regions beyond you, and not to boast
in another mans line, of things made ready to our hand. All may
plainly see, that here is nothing spoken of a rule of faith, or a
rule for the understanding of the Scripture. And therefore
most impertinently is 2 Cor. 10. 16. cited, as if the Apostle
there did speak of a rule of faith made ready to their hands. And so
also is that of not measuring our selves by our selves. 2 Cor. 10. 12.

Neither can our Adversaries ever be able to prove that by the
forme of Doctrine mentioned *Rom. 6. 17.* the Apostle did meane
any other Doctrine, then what is contained in the Scripture:
or that any Doctrine, but the Doctrine of the Scripture is
meant by that which was committed to *Timothens* trust; *1 Tim. 6.*
20. which the Apostle there bids him keep, avoiding profane, and
vaine babblings, &c. Though such as are unlearned, and unstable
wrest the Scriptures; *2 Pet. 3. 16.* yet the same Apostle in
the same Epistle doth teach us to take heed to the Scripture; as to
a light shining in a darke place *2 Pet. 1. 19.*

That

That the Apostle spake of any unwritten tradition, as a rule whereby to interpret Scriptures, *2 Tim. 2.2.* can never be made good: by the things, which *Timothy* heard him, and was to commit to faithful men, &c. hee meant nothing but the Doctrine of the Gospell, as the forementioned * *Cajetan* doth truly interpret: and that Doctrine, I presume, is no where to be found, but in the Scripture. Surely the Apostle in the next Chapter after tells *Timothy*, that from a child, hee had known the holy Scriptures, which were able to make him wise unto salvation, thorough faith, which is in *Christ Iesus. 2 Tim. 3. 15.*

After the Scriptures, the Marquesse cites the Fathers as being of this opinion, viz. *Irenæus L. 4. c. 45. Tertull. de Praescript. and Vincent. Lirin. in suo Commentario* (perhaps it should be *Com- monitorio*) But it will not appeare, that the Fathers held any rule of faith, and of interpreting the Scripture, besides the Scripture it selfe. His Majesty (as I noted before) cited above twice as many Fathers, as the Marquesse here alledgeth, plainly testifying that the Scriptures are their own interpreters, and that matters of faith are to be decided by them. I will adde a few more testimonies of the Fathers to this purpose. ^a *As wee doe not deny* (saith *Hierome*) those things which are written, so we refuse those things, which are not written. ^b *I adore* (saith *Tertullian*) the fulnesse of the Scripture. And againe, ^c *Let Hermogenes* (saith hee) shew that it is written. If it be not written, let him feare that wee appointed for those that either adde to the Scripture, or detract from it. ^d *Wee doe Cyprian no wrong* (saith *Anstine*) when wee distinguish any of his writings from the canonick authority of the Divine Scriptures. For not without cause is such a wholesome Ecclesiasticall rule of vigilancy constituted, to which certaine Bookes of the Prophets and the Apostles belong, which we may not at all dare to judge, and according to which wee may freely judge of other writings, whether they bee of Believers,

* Evangelicos siquidem sermones intelligit dicendo, & quæ audisti à me. *Cajet. in 2 Tim. 2.*

Page 60 and 61.

Page 50.

^a Ut hæc, quæ scripta sunt, non negamus, ita ea, quæ non sunt scripta, renuimus. *Hieron. advers. Helvid.*

^b Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem. *Tertull. contra Hermog. cap. 22.*

^c Scripturam esse doceat *Hermogenis* officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat vè illud adjicientibus, aut detrahentibus destinatum. *Tertull. Ibid.*

^d Nos nullam *Cypriano* facinus injuriam, cum ejus quasslibet literas à canonicâ divintrum Scripturarum autoritate distinguimus. Neque enim sine causâ tam saluber vigilantie canon Ecclesiasticus constitutus est, ad quem certi Prophetarum & Apostolorum libri pertineant, quos omnino judicare non audeamus, & secundum quos de cæteris literis vel fidelium, vel infidelium liberè judicemus. *Aug. contra Gresan. lib. 2. cap. 31.*

Ego Epistolæ hujus autoritate non teneor, quia literas *Cypriani* non ut Canonicas habeo, sed eas ex Canonicis confidero, & quod in eis divina- rum Scripturarum authoritati congruit, cum laude ejus accipio, quod autem non congruit, cum pace ejus respuo, *Aug. ibid.*

With his praise, and what is not agreeable, I refuse with his leave. For

* Ubi igitur charismata Domini posita sunt, ibi discere oportet veritatem, apud quos est ea, quæ est ab Apostolis, Ecclesiæ successio, & id, quod est sanum, irreprobabile sermonis constat. Hi enim & eam, quæ est in unum Deum, qui omnia fecit, fidem nostram custodiunt, & eam, quæ est in filium Dei, dilectionem adaugent, qui tantas dispositiones propter nos fecit, & Scripturas sine periculo nobis exponunt, neque Deum blasphemantes, neque Patriarchas exhorantes, neque prophetas contemnentes. *Iren. lib. 4. cap. 45.*

speakes of some, of whom truth was to be learnt, who kept the faith, and did expound the Scriptures without danger: but hee doth not say, that they had any unwritten rule of faith, or any such rule, whereby to expound the Scriptures. No; for so

Ostensiones, quæ sunt in Scripturis, non possunt ostendi nisi ex ipsis Scripturis. *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 12.*

Adde hereunto another saying of the Father very pertinent to the purpose. *We have not known (saith hee)*

Non per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ, quam per eos, per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem præconiaverunt, postea verò per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis traderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum. *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 1.*

or of unbelievers. And againe, I am not bound (saith hee) by the authority of this Epistle (viz. of Cyprian) because I doe not account Cyprians writings as Canonicall, but I examine them by those that are Canonicall, and that which is in them agreeable to the authority of the Divine Scriptures, I receive

Irenaus lib. 4. cap. 45. hath nothing that may seeme to make that way except this, Where (saith hee) the gifts of the Lord are placed, there wee ought to learne truth, of those with whom is that succession of the Church; which is from the Apostles; and that sound speech not to be reproved. For they keepe that faith of ours, which is in one God, that made all things, and increase that love, which is towards the Son of God, who did such great things for us, and they without danger expound unto us the Scriptures, neither blaspheming God, nor dishonoring the Patriarchs, nor contemning the Prophets. Here Irenaus

speakes of some, of whom truth was to be learnt, who kept the faith, and did expound the Scriptures without danger: but hee doth not say, that they had any unwritten rule of faith, or any such rule, whereby to expound the Scriptures. No; for so Irenaus should not agree with himselfe, who faith (as His Majesty observed) that the evidences, which are in the Scriptures, cannot be manifested but by the Scriptures themselves.

that the dispensation of our salvation but by those, by whom the Gospell came unto us: which Gospell they preached, and afterward by the Will of God delivered unto us in the Scriptures, as that which should be for the foundation and pillar

pillar of our Faith. So much for *Irenæus*; The Marquesse cites the words of *Tertullian*, and so of *Vincentius*: *Tertullians* words (as he cites them) are these, Wee doe not admit our adversaries to dispute out of Scripture, till they can shew, who their ancestors were, and from whom they received the Scriptures. For the ordinary course of Doctrine requires, that the first question should be, from whom, and by whom, and to whom the forme of *Christian Religion* was delivered, otherwise prescribing against him as a stranger. These words I cannot finde, nor any like unto them in the place cited, viz. *de Prascrip. cap. 11.* elsewhere indeed in that booke I finde words like unto these, though not the same. However if wee should be tried by these words, I see not how they will conclude against us. For though the Heretickes, with whom *Tertullian* had to doe, might be convinced otherwise then by Scripture, it followes not, that therefore this is not the ordinary way whereby to convince Hereticks. Thus Christ convinced the *Sadduces* that denied the Resurrection, *Mat. 22. 29.* &c. thus *Apollos* convinced the Jewes, who denied Jesus to be the Christ: *Acts 18. 28.* And thus the Apostles convinced those that urged Circumcision, and the observing of the Jewish Law, *Acts 15. 15.* &c. And thus both other Fathers, and even *Tertullian* himselfe doth usually dispute against Heretickes, and confute them by the Scriptures.

But (saith the Marquesse) If a Heathen should come by the Bible, as the Eunuch came by the prophecy of *Elay*, and have no Philip to interpret it unto him, hee would find out a Religion rather according to his own fancy, then Divine verity. Be it so, yet here is nothing to prove, that this Philip, that is to interpret the Bible, is not to fetch his interpretation from the Bible it selfe, but from some unwritten tradition. I come to *Vincentius Lirinensis*, whose words produced by the Marquesse, run thus, It is very needfull in regard of so many errors proceeding from misinterpretations of Scriptures, that the line of propheticall and Apostolicall exposition should be directed according to the rule of the Ecclesiasticall and Catholike sense. But I see not, that in the opinion of *Vincentius*, the rule of the Ecclesiasticall and Catholike sense is any other then the Scripture. He insists much (I am sure) upon those words of the Apostle, If wee, or an Angell
 V
 from

from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, then that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed, Gal. 1. 8. Now, as was noted before out of Irenæus, the Gospel, which the Apostles preached, they delivered unto us in the Scriptures, and that is the foundation and pillar of our Faith.

Indeed, all that Vincentius in his Commonitory against Heresies, aims at, is this, That the Faith once delivered to the Saints (as Saint Jude speaks) might be preserved. To which end he descants well upon those words of the Apostle : O Timothy, keep that which

Id quod tibi creditum est, non quod à te inventum ; quod accepisti, non quod excogitasti ; rem non ingenii, sed doctrinæ ; non usurpationis privaræ, sed publicæ traditionis : rem ad te perductam, non à te prolatam ; in quâ non autor debes esse, sed custos ; non institutor, sed sectator ; non ducens, sed sequens, Vincent. loc. citat.

is committed to thy trust, 1 Tim. 6. 20. That which is committed to thee, not that which is invented by thee ; that which thou hast received, not that which thou hast devised ; a matter not of wit, but of doctrine ; not of private usurpation, but of public tradition ; a thing brought unto thee, not brought forth by thee, in which thou art not to be an author, but a keeper ; not an ordainer, but an observer ; not a leader, but a

follower. That this Depositum, or thing committed to Timothy, was any unwritten Tradition, and not the doctrine of the Gospel contained in the Scripture ; neither doth Vincentius say,

Dico illa omnia scripta esse ab Apostolis, quæ sunt omnibus necessaria, &c. Bellarm. de Verbo non scripto lib. 4. c. 11.

Loquitur Origenes de obscurissimis questionibus, quales ut plurimum non sunt illæ, quæ testimonium habent traditionis in totâ Ecclesiâ receptæ. Bellar. Ibid.

neither can it be proved. Bellarmine himself is forced to confess, That all things necessary for all, are written by the Apostles : Yea, and that those things which have the testimony of Tradition (he means unwritten tradition) received in the whole Church, are not usually such as concern most obscure questions. And how then should such Tradition be the Rule of Faith, and of Expounding the Scriptures ?

Pag. 60,
& 61,

The Marquess saith, that in matters of Faith Christ bids us to observe, and do whatsoever they bid us, who sit in Moses Seat, Mat. 23. 2, 3 ; whence he infers, Therefore surely there is something more to be observed then only Scripture : Will you not as well believe what you hear Christ say, as what you hear his Ministers write ? You hear Christ when you hear them, as well as you read Christ when you read his Word. He that heareth you heareth me, Luk. 10. 16.

Thus the Marquess, but it was from our Saviours meaning, that

that the people should doe simply, and absolutely, whatsoever the Scribes and Pharisees, who sat in *Moses Seat*, should enjoin. Our Saviour meant nothing lesse, for expressly he bade beware of the Leaven of the Pharisees, *Mat. 16. 6.* that is, of the Doctrine of the Pharisees, *v. 12.* Our Saviours meaning therefore was only this, that whiles the Scribes and Pharisees sitting in *Moses Seat*, did deliver the Law and Doctrine of *Moses*, people should hear and obey, though otherwise they were most corrupt both in life & Doctrine.

The Jesuite *Maldonate* doth thus expound the place, as indeed it cannot with any probability be otherwise expounded.

When Christ (saith he) *bids observe, and doe what the Scribes and Pharisees say, whiles they sit in Moses seat, he speaks not of their Doctrine, but of the Doctrine of the Law, and of Moses. For it is as if he should say, All things, that the Law, and Moses shall say unto you, the Scribes and Pharisees rehearsing it, observe, and do; but after their workes doe not.*

It's true, Christ doth tell us, that they that hear his Ministers, hear him, but that is, when they speak as his Ministers, when they speak his Word, not their owne. As God said to the Prophet *Ezekiel*, *Thou shalt speak my Words unto them*, *Ezek. 2. 7.* And to the Prophet *Jeremy*, *Speak unto them all that I command thee*, *Jer. 1. 17.* And so Christ to his Apostles, *Teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you*, *Mat. 28. 20.* So then, we hear Christ indeed, when we hear his Word spoken by his Ministers, as well as we read Christ, when we read his Word written in the Scriptures. But that which we hear, must be tried by that which we read; that which is spoken by Ministers, by that which is written in the Scriptures, as hath been shewed before by *Isai. 8. 20.* *Joh. 5. 39.* *Act. 17. 11.*

We say (saith the Marquesse) *the Scriptures are not easie to be understood, you say they are: We have Scripture for it, as is before manifested at large. The Fathers say as much, &c.*

We doe not say that the Scriptures throughout in every part of them are easie to be understood, but that they are so in things necessary unto Salvation. This hath been shewed before by the testimony both of the Scripture it self, and of *Austine*, as likewise that the places of Scripture objected by the Marquesse, doe

Cum jubet servare, & facere, quæ Scribæ & Pharisei, dum in Cathedrà Moïsis sedent, dicunt, non de ipsorum, sed de Legis ac Moïsi doctrinā loquuntur. Perinde enim est, ac si dicat, Omnia, quæ Lex, & Moïses vobis dixerint, Scribæ & Pharisei recitantibus, servate & facite; secundū autē opera, &c. *Mald. ad Mat. 23. 23.*

Pag. 61.

Ans.

make nothing against the easinesse of the Scripture, either at all; or at least in this sense. Neither are the Fathers, here alledged by the Marquesse, against it.

*Bell. de Verbi
Dei Interpret.*

l. 3. c. 1.

Iren. l. 2. c. 4. 7.

*Origen. l. 7. contra
Cels. apud
Bell. ubi supra.*

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Idem. l. 7. c. 20.

Irenaeus (whose words the Marquesse produceth not, but *Bellarmino* doth) saith onely that of those things which are contained in the Scriptures, *quodam*, some are such that we must commend unto God, meaning that we cannot perfectly know them: This is nothing repugnant to what we say. Nor that which is said by *Origen* (whom the Marquesse onely citeth at large, *contra Cels.* but I find both the book and the words in *Bellarmino*) viz. that the Scripture is *Multiis locis obscura*, in many places obscure; of which, what Protestant (I marvell) doth make any question? So when *Ambrose*, *Epist.* 44. calleth the Scripture a Sea, and a depth of propheticall Riddles: And *Hierom*, *Prefat. comment. in Ephes.* saith, that he took great pains to understand the Scripture: And *Aufine*, *Epist.* 119. cap. 21. saith, that the things of Holy Scripture, which he knew not, were more than those he knew: And *Dionysius*, B. of *Corinth*, (cited by *Ensebius*, *Hist.* l. 7. c. 20) saith, that the matter of the Scriptures was farre more profound then his Wit could reach; what is all this against Protestants, who onely hold that the Scriptures, in things that concern Faith, and Manners, are not so obscure, but that they ought to be read, or heard by all, and that all may profit by the

*Chrysostomus ad exortandum cor-
porem multorum, qui possent, si vellent,
magno cum fructu Scripturas legere,
illis amplificationibus uti solet. Bell.
de verbi Dei Interpret. l. 3. c. 2.*

reading or hearing of them? And in this sense *Bellarmino* yieldeth that *Chrysostome* in diverse places doth affirme the Scriptures to be plain and easie, viz. to shake off the laziness of many, who might, if they would, read the Scriptures with much benefit. And

besides, we hold, that where the Scripture is obscure, the interpretation of it is to be fetched from the Scripture it self, against which these Fathers say nothing, but both diverse of these, and also diverse others (as hath been shewed) doe plainly avouch it.

Page. 61.

The Marquesse proceeds, saying, *We say that this Church cannot erre, you say it can: We have Scripture for what we say, such Scripture that will tell you that fools cannot erre therein, Eysay 35. 8. Such Scripture that will tell you, If you neglect to hear it, you shall be a heathen, and a publican, Mat. 18. 17. Such Scripture as will tell you,*

you, that this Church shall be unto Christ a glorious Church, that shall be without spot or wrinkle, Ephes. 5. 27. Such a Church as shall be enlivened for ever with his Spirit, Esay 59. 21. The Fathers as-
firme the same, &c.

Concerning the Churches erring, or not erring, we must distinguish of the Church, and of Errour. The Church is either visible, which consisteth both of good and bad, which therefore is compared to a Net, &c. *Mat. 13. 47. &c.* or invisible, which consisteth onely of the Elect, and true Beleevers, *The Lord knoweth who are his, 2 Tim. 2. 19.* Men may know who professe themselves to be his, but who are indeed, only God knoweth. *All the Elect, they are the Church, saith Bernard.* And to the same effect *Au-*

ustine, The Church consisteth of those that are good, who build upon the Rock, not of those that build upon the Sand. As for Errour, it is either damnable, or not damnable. Now it is granted, that the invisible Church cannot erre damnablely. For this is that Church which Christ speaketh of, and saith, *That the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, Mat. 16. 18.* But for the Church Visible, whether our Adversaries mean the Church Virtual, whereby they understand the Pope, or the Church Representative, that is, a Generall Councell, we hold that it may Erre, and that damnablely. The Scriptures alledged are not against this assertion. That *Esai. 35. 8.* speaks not of the Church, but of a Way, called there, *The Way of Holinesse*; so sure and safe, that *Wayfaring men, though fooles, shall not Erre therein.* That *Mat. 18. 17.* onely shewes that a member of the Church, being justly admonished by the Church, ought to submit to the Admonition of it, or else is to be accounted as a Publican or Heathen. But this is farre from proving the Churches infallibility. That *Ephes. 5. 27.* shewes, not what the Church is here in this world, but what it shall be hereafter in the world to come; ** It is not so to be understood (saith Austine) as if the Church were now so, but that it is prepared that it may be so.* And accordingly † *Bede, In the* plenè & perfectè erit non habens maculam, aut rugam, &c. Cum enim non tantum dixit, ut exhiberet tibi ecclesiam non habentem maculam aut rugam, sed addidit, gloriosam, satis significavit, quando erit sine maculâ & rugâ. *Beda ad loc.*

Answe.

Electi omnes, ipsi Ecclesia sunt. Bern. in Cant. Serm. 78.

In bonis est ecclesia, in his, qui ædificant super petram, non in his, qui ædificant super arenam. Aug. de Unit. Eccles.

* Non est ita intelligendum quasi Ecclesia ita jam sit, sed quia præparatur ut sit. *Aug. in Retractat.*

† In regno cælorum Ecclesia

Kingdome of Heaven the Church shall be fully and perfectly without spot or wrinkle, &c. For when as the Apostle did not only say that he might present it to himself, a Church not having spot or wrinkle, but also added Glorious; he sufficiently signified when it shall be without Spot or Wrinkle. That *Esai.* 59. 21. sheweth that God will give both his Word and his Spirit for ever unto his Church, but it speaks of the invisible Church, the Elect and Godly, Such as turn from Transgression, ver. 20. not of any outward visible Church, which hath no such priviledge, but that it may erre, and so erre as to cease to be a Church, as the example of the Churches of Asia, mentioned *Revel.* 2. & 3. doth make manifest.

For the Fathers, the first whom the Marquess citeth is *Austine*, whom (as before is shewed) holdeth Generall Councils lyable to Errour, and such, as that the former may be corrected by the latter. That therefore which he saith, * *Contra Crescon.* l. 1. c. 33. (so, I presume it should be, not cap. 3. as it is in the Marquess his Paper) viz. That we hold the truth of the Scriptures, when we do that, which hath pleased the whole Church, which the authority of the same Scriptures doth commend: That (I say) must be understood, so farre forth as the Scriptures doe commend the Church, we do well, and conformably to the Scriptures, in conforming to it. But I see not how *Austine* himself could hold the Church to be so commended in the Scriptures, as that we must simply and absolutely doe what the Church pleaseth. For then, what need of having one Generall Council to be corrected and amended by another? Our Adversaries themselves, when they please, make no scruple of waving and altering that which was generally held and practised in the Church.

Missam facio Augustini & Innocentii sententiam, quæ 600. circiter annos viguit in Ecclesiâ, Eucharistiam etiam infantibus esse necessariam. Res jam ab Ecclesiâ, & multorum seculorum usu, & decreto concilii Tridentini explicata est, non solum non necessariam illis esse, sed ne decere quidem dari. Maldon. ad Feb. 6. 53.

to be given unto them. Cyprian, Epist. 55. (who is the next that the

Marquess citeth) speaketh indeed of the Authority of the Church

I let passe (saith Maldonate) the opinion of Austine, and of Innocentius, which about 600. yeares did prevails in the Church, that the Eucharist is necessary even for Infants. The thing is now declared by the Church, both by the Custome of many Ages, and also by the decrees of the Council of Trent, that it is not only not necessary for them, but also that it is not meet

Church, but how? so as to censure and excommunicate those that deserve it, about that hee writes unto *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*. But this is much short of proving the Church to be infallible, and that it cannot erre.

Cyprian was far from ascribing so much to the Church, when (as 'tis well known) contrary to what the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Church generally did hold, he held the re-baptizing of such as had been baptized by Heretikes. Though *Cyprian* in this did erre, yet his very erring in this, shewes that hee thought the Church, the generality of the visible Church, not onely subject to error, but indeed to have erred.

The last Father, whom the Marquesse here mentioneth (for though hee say *cum multis aliis*, yet hee nameth no more) is

* *Irenaeus* l. 3. c. 4. where he saith, *It is not meet to seeke the truth among others, which it is easie to take of the Church, seeing the Apostles did lay in it, as in a rich depository, all things that concerne truth, that every one that will, may out of it receive the drinke of life.*

* Non oportet adhuc quærere a quod alios veritatem, quam facile est ab Ecclesiâ sumere, cum Apostoli quasi in depositarium dives, plenissimè in eâ contulerint omnia, quæ sint veritatis, uti omnis quicumque velit, sumat ex eâ potum vitæ. *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 4.*

This indeed is gloriously spoken of the Church, and not Hyperbolically neither; yet doth it not amount to this, that the Church cannot erre. The holy Scriptures, wherein all saving truth is contained, are committed to the Church, and the Doctrine of salvation is ordinarily held forth in, and by the Church; but hence it doth not follow, that the Church, that is, such as beare sway in it, is not subject to error. All that *Irenaeus* saith of the Church is no more, if so much as that of the Apostle, *1 Tim. 3. 15.* that the Church is the pillar and ground of truth; which place it may seeme strange that the Marquesse pretermitteth. *Bellarmine* disputing this point, brings in those words in the very first place, to prove that the Church cannot erre. And whereas *Calvin* answers, that the Church is so styled by the Apostle, because in it the Scriptures are preserved and preached, he replies, that thus the Church should rather be compared to a Chest, then to a Pillar. But this is a frivolous objection; for the Church doth not keepe the truth close and secret, as a thing is kept in a chest; but so as to professe and pub-

Beil. de Eccles. mili. 4. li. 3. cap. 4.

lish.

hish it, and therefore is compared to a Pillar, to which a thing is fastned, and so hangeth, that all may see it. But that those words of the Apostle do not infer an infallibility of the Church, and an exemption from errour, is cleare by this, that he speaks of a particular visible Church, namely the Church of *Ephesus*; now that a particular visible Church may erre, our Adversaries will not deny, and that very Church of *Ephesus* there spoken of doth sufficiently demonstrate. The Apostle therefore in those words doth rather shew the duty of the Church then the dignity of it; rather what it should be, then what it alwayes is. As when it is said *Mal. 2. 7. Labia sacerdotis custodient scientiam*, *The Priests lips shall keep knowledge*, that is (as our translations rightly render it) *should keepe*. So the Jesuite *Ribera* doth expound it, *shall keepe*, that is (saith he) ought to keepe.

Custodient, id est, custodire debent. Rib. ad *Mal. 2.*

The Marquesse here comes againe to the visibility of the Church, and some other particulars before handled. That the Church is alwayes visible, he proves by *Mat. 5. 14, 15. The light of the World, a City upon a Hill cannot be hid*. But I have shewed before these words, *Ye are the light of the world*, to be meant of the Apostles, who (as their own *Jansenius* expounds it) were a light unto the World by their preaching.

* Οὐκ ἔθνεα δὲ ἐν ἐρώτισαν ἔτοι, ἀλλὰ τὸν κόσμον. *Theophyl.* ad. loc.

So also * *Theophylact*, *They did not enlighten* (saith hee) *one Nation, but the whole world*.

Παιδεύει αὐτοὺς ἐκ γωνίας εἶναι, καὶ ἀκριβεῖς περὶ τὸν βίον, ὡς παρὰ πάντων βλέπεσθαι μέλλοντας. μὴ γὰρ νομίσης, ὅτι ἐκ γωνίας κρυβήσῃς, ἀλλὰ περὶ πάντων ἔσῃ. ὅς σε βλέπει πᾶς ἄνθρωπος. ἵνα μὴ καὶ ἐπὶ σέ τι κακὸν ἔσται. *Theophyl. ibid.*

And the words following, *A City set upon a Hill cannot be hid*, he shewes to have been spoken by way of instruction. *Christ* (saith hee) doth instruct them to be carefull and accurate in the ordering of their life, as being to be seene of all. As if hee should say, Doe not thinke, that you shall lie hid in a corner; no, you shall be conspicuous. And therefore see that ye live unblameably, that so you may not give offence to others. This exposition suites well

with the admonition given *vers. 16. Let your light so shine before men, that they seeing your good workes may glorifie your Father which is in Heaven*.

The Marquesse here further addes, *2 Cor. 4. 3. & Isai. 22.* I suppose it should be, *Isai. 1. 2.* Now the former of these two places

places is not to the purpose, *viz.* to prove a perpetuall visibility of the Church. For how can that be inferred from those words of the Apostle, *If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost*? The Apostle having said *vers. 2. by manifestation of the truth commending our selves to every man's conscience in the sight of God*, because (as *Occumenius* notes) it might be objected, that the truth was not made manifest unto all, for that all did not believe, to prevent this Objection the Apostle adds, *If our Gospel be hid, &c.*

As if hee should say, It is not our fault, as if the Gospel were not plainly enough preached by us, but it is their own fault, who perish through their owne blindness. That *Isai. 2. 2.* is more to the purpose, though not enough neither. It is said that in the *last dayes the Mountaine of the Lords House shall be established in the top of the Mountaines, and shall be exalted above the Hills, and all Nations shall flow unto it.* The Prophet there sheweth, (by metaphoricall expressions taken from Mount *Sion*, where the Temple stood) that by the preaching of the Gospel, the Church should be increased and exalted farre above what it was before. This prophesie was fulfilled by the bringing in of the Gentiles: but the Prophet doth not say, that in the times of the Gospel the Church should alwayes be so conspicuous and visible. Neither doe the Fathers here alledged by the Marquesse, *viz. Origen, Chrysostome, Augustine and Cyprian*, speake of the perpetuall condition of the Church, but onely as it was in their time. I have proved before by Scriptures, and Fathers, and even by the acknowledgement of our Adversaries, that the Church is not perpetually visible.

After the Visibility of the Church, the Marquesse speaketh of the Universality of it, saying that the universality of the Church is perpetuall, and that the Church of *Rome* is such a Church. For prooffe hereof hee citeth, *Psal. 2. 8. Rom. 1. 8.* Now the former place shewes that Christ should have the heathen for his inheritance, and the ends of the Earth for his possession; and consequently that the Church should not be confined (as it was

Επειδὴ ἔτι, καὶ πᾶσαν συνήθη-
σιν ἀνθρώπων συνίσταται διὰ τῆς
ἀληθείας φανερώσεως, τούτοις οὖν κα-
ρὲν μαλαθὲρ ἀνέλεοντο δὲ αὐτοὺς τὸ μὴ
πᾶσιν ἔσθαι φανερὸν τὸ κήρυγμα
(καὶ δὴλον ὅτι οὐκ ἐκτίσενσαν) φη-
σιν, ὅτι ἡμῶν τὸ ἔγκλημα, ἢ τῆς
ἀσφαλείας οὐ ἐπαγγέλιν, ἀλλὰ τῆς
ἐκείνων ἀπειρίας καὶ ὑπερβολῆς.

Occumen. ad. 2. Cor. 4. 3.

in the time of the Law) to one Country, but should be extended farre and wide throughout the World. This also hath been fulfilled, and yet shall be: but hence it doth not follow, that the Church is alwayes so universally extended throughout the World, but that sometimes errors and heresies doe so prevaile and overspread all, that the truth in comparison can finde no room. See before page 2. The other place, viz. *Rom. 1. 8* testifies indeed that the Church of *Rome* was a true Church, and famous throughout the World: but neither doth the Apostle there say, neither (so farre as I see) can it in any congruity be said, that the Church of *Rome* either is, or was a Church universally spread thorough the World. A part, and an eminent part of the Church so universall it might be, but the whole universall Church it could not be. The Apostle there saith no more of the *Romans*, then he doth of the *Thessalonians*, *1 Thess. 1. 8*. yet (I presume) our Adversaries will not therefore admit either the Church of *Thessalonica* to be universall, or ever since the Apostles time to have continued sound and Orthodox. And why then will they thinke to inforce so much from the Apostles words for the Church of *Rome*? To these two places of Scripture the Marquise addeth the testimonies of three Fathers, viz. *Cyprian*, *Austine*, and *Hierome*. But for the first of these, his words are pitifully mistaken. They are these, *Dum apud vos una animus, et una vox est, Ecclesia unius Romanæ confessi* of the Marquise renders in thus, whilst with you there is one minde, and one voyce, the whole Church is confessed to be the Roman Church: whereas any that can understand Latine, and will minde the words, may see that they are to be rendeed thus, whilst with you there is one minde, and one voyce, the whole Roman Church hath confessed. *Cyprian* here wrote to *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, who together with others had before heathen persecutors confessed the faith. For this *Cyprian* commends them, and saith that they so confessing as they did, and all being of one minde, and one voyce, the whole Roman Church did confesse. This makes indeed for the soundnesse of the Roman Church, as it was in *Cyprian*'s time, but for the universality of it, as if it were the universall Church, or a Church universally diffused, it makes nothing. For *Austine*'s words *de unit. Ecclesi. cap. 4. Who*

*Cyprian. ad
Cornel. Epist.
57.*

so doth not communicate with the whole corps of Christendome, certain it is, that they are not in the holy Catholick Church, I kee not what they are to the purpose. They cannot be so understood, as that all must necessarily communicate with all that are of the corps of Christendome, that is, that profess themselves Christians. For so all should be tied to communion with grosse and notorious Heretikes. They must then be understood of communicating with all Christians so faire forth as they are indeed Christians: but what is this to prove either the peremall universality of the Church, or that the Church of Rome is such a Church? *Anstine* wrote against the Donatists, who confined the Church to Affrike, excluding all the World besides from being of the Church. This is nothing against us, who doe not confine the Church to any place whatsoever.

The last Father here cited is *Hierome*, who has the Marquesse tellecth us) saith, *That is is all one to say the Roman Faith, and the Catholick Faith.* But the Marquesses quotation of the place where this is to be found in *Hierome*, is too lax, viz. in a place *ad Ruffin.* it should be *adversus Ruffin.* But there are two Apologies which *Hierome* wrote against *Ruffin*, and one of them divided into severall Bookes; it was meet therefore that the place should have been cited more particularly then it is. Yet I think I have met with the place which the Marquesse meaneth, which yet doth not speake so much as the Marquesse supposeth.

Ruffinus translating *Origen's* workes (which had many grosse errors in them) into Latine, to justifie himselfe said, the Latine Reader shall finde nothing, that differs from our faith.

Hereupon *Hierome* asked, what saith he meant by our faith? whether that faith, which did flourish in the Church of Rome, or that, which was contained in the workes of *Origen*? If (saith hee) he shall answer, The Roman faith then are we Catholicks, who have translated nothing of *Origen's* errors: but if *Origen's* blasphemy be his faith, whilst he chargen us with inconsistency, he proves himselfe an Heretick. Here indeed *Hierome* implieth the Roman

Nihil, inquit, in illis, quod a fide nostra discrepet: Latinus Lector inveniet. Eidem quam quam vocat? eamne, qua Romana pollet Ecclesia? an illam, quae in Origenis voluminibus continetur? Si Romanam responderit, ergo Catholici sumus, qui nihil de Origenis errore transtulimus: sin autem Origenis blasphemia fides illius est, dum mihi inconstantiae crimen impingit, se haereticum probat. *Hieron. apol. 1. advers. Ruffin. lib. 1. cap. 1.*

faith, and the Catholick faith, to have been then when he wrote one and the same, yet not simply, but so farre forth as did concerne the errors of *Origen*. But how can any justly hence conclude, that in *Hieromes* Dialect it's all one to say the Roman faith, and the Catholick faith: as if in *Hieromes* opinion the Roman faith, and the Catholick faith, in all points, and at all times must needs be the same.

That *Hierome* did not overvalue the Church of *Rome* is evident. For when the custome of that Church was objected against something that hee held, hee rejected the authority of it with some disdain, saying, *If wee seek authority, the World is greater then the City*. And againe, *what doe you bringing the custome of one City?*

Page 62.

From Universality the Marquesse passeth to Unity, saying that the unity of the Church is necessary in all points of faith, and proving it first by Scriptures, as *Ephes. 4. 5. Acts 4. 35. and 1 Cor. 1. 10.* then by fathers, as *Anstine contra Par. l. 3. c. 5. Cyr. de unit. Eccles.* and *Hilar. ad Constant.* Now this unity of the Church hath been spoken of before, and it hath beene shewed how far it is requisite, as also how little cause they of the Church of *Rome* have either to applaud themselves for it, or to upbraide the Reformed Churches for want of it. *There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism*, saith the Apostle, *Eph. 4. 5.* well, suppose they of the Roman church have one faith, yet except they have the one faith, this, of which the Apostle speaketh, what are they the better? But indeed neither is their faith so one, as they pretend, there being many great and weighty points, where in they differ one from another. See *Gerard loc. com. de Eccles. Sect. 240 &c.*

On the other side (as I have said before) if the confessions of the reformed churches be lookt upon rather then particular mens opinions, or perhaps expressions, there will no great difference in points of faith be found amongst them. *Acts 4. 35.* here cited by the Marquesse, is not to the purpose, as not speaking of unity of faith, but rather of affection, *1 Cor. 1. 10.* the Apostle exhorts them to unity, and that there might be no divisions among them; but because there was not such unity, as

was

was meet, but there were divisions among them, he doth not therefore say, that they were no true Church: In a word, both the Scriptures and the Fathers are for the unity of the Church in points of Faith, and so are we; that the severall Articles of Protestant Churches deny this Unity, the Marquesse affirmeth, but doth not prove it.

We hold (saith the Marquesse) that every Minister of the Church, especially the Supreme Minister, or Head thereof, should be in a capacity of functioning his Office in Preaching the Gospel, Administring the Sacrament, Baptizing, Marrying, and not otherwise. This we have Scripture for, Heb. No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as Aaron was. This you deny; and not onely so, but you so deny it, as that your Church hath maintained and practised it a long time, for a Woman to be head, or Supreme Moderator in the Church; when you know that according to the Word of God (in this respect) a woman is not onely forbidden to be the head of the man, but to have a tongue in her head, 1 Tim. 2. 11. 1 Cor. 14. 34. Tis so hath this been denied by you, that many have been hang'd, drawn and quarter'd for not acknowledging it. The Fathers are of our opinion, &c.

Pag. 62,
& 63.

All this is but to strike at the Title which hath been given to our Kings and Queens, viz. Supreme Heads, or Governours, and Governesses of the Church within their Dominions. We know our Adversaries have much stomach'd, and opposed this Title, but we know no just cause that they have had for it. We never made Kings or Queens Ministers of the Church, so as to dispense the Word, and Sacraments, only we have attributed unto them this Power, to look to, and have a care of the Church, that the Word be Preached, and the Sacraments Administred by fit persons, and in a right manner. This is no more than belongs unto Kings and Queens, as both Scriptures and Fathers doe informe us. We see in the Scriptures, that the good Kings of Judah, as *Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah*, (not to speak of *David* and *Solomon*, who were Prophets as well as Kings, and so may be excepted against as extraordinary persons) did put forth their power in ordering the Affaires of the Church, as well as of the Civill State. *Asa* put down Idolatry, and caused the People to enter into Covenant to serve the Lord, 2 Chron. 15. *Jehoshaphat* took

Ans.

away the High Places, and the Groves, and made the Priests and Levites to goe and teach the People, *1 Chron. 17. Heretofore* reformed what had been amisse in matter of Gods Worship, caused the Priests and Levites to do their Duty, and the Passover to be solemnly kept, *1 Chron. 29. & 30. & 31.* So *Josiah* also destroyed Idolatry, repaired the Temple, and kept a most solemn Passover, causing both Priests and People to performe their Duty.

Austine acknowledgeth this power to belong unto Kings. *In this* (saith he) *Kings, as they are commanded of God, doe serve God as Kings, if in their Kingdomes they command good things, and forbid evil things, not only which belong unto humane Societies, but also which concerne Divine Religion.* And the same Father speaking of Christian Princes, makes their happines to lie in this, *That they make their power serviceable to Gods majesty, in enlarging his worship, as much as they are able.*

Si suam potestatem ad Dei cultum maximè dilarandum, majestati ejus famulam faciunt. *Aug. de Civili Dei. lib. 5. c. 24.*

This power also Christian Princes have exercised, and have not been taxed for it, as *Constantine, Theodosius, &c.* See *Maison de Minist. Anglic. lib. 3. cap. 4.* The exercising therefore of this power which we ascribe to Kings and Queenes, is no taking that Honour to themselves, which is spoken of *Heb. 3. 4.* Neither is it any teaching, or speaking in the Church, which the Apostle will not allow unto a woman, *1 Tim. 2. 11, 12.* and *1 Cor. 14. 34.* Neither is this crosse to what the Fathers, whom the Marquess citeeth, say, which amounts to this, that Ministers are to doe those things which belong unto Ministers, and that in those things which concern their Ministry, all, even Kings and Queenes, are subject unto them. All this is nothing against Kings and Queenes having a power over Ministers, so as to see them performe the Offices which belong unto them. And it may seeme strange that the Marquess should now so lately with so much eagernes invaign against that Title, and Power, given to that Queen of happy memory, *Q. Elizabeth*, as most unmeet for her, when as *Hart*, a Papist, misse enough living in the Queens time, by his Conference with Doctor *Rainolds*, and Doctor *Nowell* Book against *Dorman*, was so convinced; that he confessed himself satisfied in

* See Doctor *Rainolds* his Conference with *Hart* in the end.

this point, and acknowledged that we ascribe no more unto Princes, then *Aufins* doth in the words before cited.

We say, that Christ gave commission to his Disciples to forgive Sinnes; you deny it, and say, that God onely can forgive sins, we have Scripture for it, Joh. 20. 23. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted: and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained. And Joh. 20. 21. As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And how was that? viz. With so great power as to forgive sins, Mat. 9. 3. 8. Where note, that S. Matthew doth not set downe, how that the people glorified God the Father, who had given so great power unto God the Son; but that he had given so great power unto men, loc. cit. The Fathers are of this opinion, &c. Pag. 63.

It is strange that the Marquesse should say, that we deny that Christ gave Commission to his Disciples to forgive Sinnes: We confesse that the Scripture is clear for it, that he did give them such a Commission; onely the question is, how the Commission is to be understood, and what power it is that the Disciples had, and so other Ministers have to forgive Sinnes? It's true, we hold that God onely can forgive sins, and yet withall, that men may forgive sins. There are not contradictory, the one to the other, because (as all Logicians know) except the propositions be understood of one and the same thing, in one and the same respect: there is no contradiction. Now when we say, that onely God can forgive sins, it is meant in one respect; and when we say, that men may forgive sinnes, it is meant in another respect. As the sin is against God, so properly and authoritatively God alone can forgive it. And this God doth challenge unto himself as his prerogative, *I, even I am he, that blotte out thy transgressions, &c. Isai. 43. 25.* And therefore the Scribes were right in this, *Who can forgive sins, but God onely? Mar. 2. 7.* They were right in the Doctrine, though wrong in the Application: their position was good, that God onely can forgive Sins; but their supposition was naught, that Christ was but a meer Man, and had not power to forgive Sins, as he did. *This (saith *Hilary) troubles the Scribes, that a man doth forgive sin; for they took Christ for a meer Man. — It is true, none can forgive sinne but God only: and therefore he that forgiveth, is in Jesu Christo contuebantur. — Verum enim, nemo potest dimittere peccata, nisi solus Deus: Ergo qui remittit Deus est, quia nemo remittit nisi Deus. Hilary in Mat. Can. 8.*

God,

God, because none forgiveth but God. The same also is clearly and fully acknowledged by *Gregory*, whom amongst other Fa-

Tu qui solus parcis, qui solus peccata dimittis. Quis enim potest peccata dimittere, nisi solus Deus? *Greg. in 2 penitent. Psal.*

thers the Marquesse alledgeth against us. He writing upon the second Penitential Psalme, that is, the 32. Psalme, upon those words, *Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin,* he saith thus, *Thou, who alone sparest, who*

alone dost forgive sinnes. For who can forgive sinnes, but God onely? And with these agreeth *Irenaeus*, whom also the Marquesse bringeth in as a witnesse on his side. He speaking of

Peccata igitur remittens, hominem quidem curavit, semetipsum autem manifeste ostendit quis esset. Si enim nemo potest remittere peccata nisi solus Deus, remittebat autem haec Dominus, & curabat homines, manifestum est, quod ipse erat Verbum Dei, filius hominis factus, &c. tanquam Deus misceretur nostri, & remittat nobis debita nostra, quae factori nostro debemus Deo. *Iren. lib. 5. pag. 583. edit. in 8º.*

Quae cum Judaei asserunt à solo Deo posse concedi, Deum utique confitentur, suoque judicio perfidiam suam produnt, &c. Itaque testimonium non deest divinitati, fides deest saluti. — Magna itaque insidiae plebis amentia, ut cum confessa fuerit solius Dei esse donare peccata, non credat peccata donanti. *Ambros. in Luc. 5.*

Deus enim ex eo cognoscitur, &c. quia peccata condonat. — Peccata nemo condonat, nisi unus Deus; quia scriptum est, Quis potest peccata donare, nisi solus Deus? *Ambros. de Spiritu Sancto lib. 3. cap. 19.*

To this purpose likewise is *Austine*, (another of the Marquesses Fathers) cited by *Lombard, lib. 4. dist. 18. lit. c.*

Christ's forgiving of sinnes, saith, *That thereby he did declare who he was: For if none can forgive sinnes but onely God, and the Lord (Christ) did forgive them, then it is manifest, that he was the Word of God, made the Son of Man, &c. and that as God he hath mercy on us, and doth forgive us our debts, which we owe unto God our Maker.* Accordingly also *Ambrose*, (another of those Fathers, whom the Marquesse maketh to be of their opinion) *Whereas (saith he) Jewes say that onely God can forgive sinnes, they doe indeed confesse Christ to be God, and by their judgement bewray their perfidionsnesse, &c. They have a testimony for Christs Divinity, they have no Faith for their owne Salvation: Therefore great is the madnesse of the unbelieving people, that when as they confesse that it belongs onely unto God to forgive sinnes, yet they doe not believe God, when he forgiveth sins.* So by this Argument the same Father proves the Holy Ghost to be God, because he forgiveth Sins. For that none can forgive sinnes but onely God, as it is written, *Who can forgive sinnes, but onely God?* Thus *Ambrose* cites that saying of the Scribes as a most undoubted truth. How then have Ministers power to forgive Sins? In that the Word of reconciliation is committed

committed unto them, 2 Cor. 5. 19. in that they are to preach remission of finnes in Christs name, Luk. 24. 47. Be it known unto you, that through this man (viz. Christ) is preached unto you forgiveness of finnes, said Paul, Act. 13. 38. Ambrose observes, that Christ first

said to his Apostles, Receive ye the holy Ghost, and then, Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted. Whence he gathers, that it is the holy Ghost that doth indeed forgive Sins. Men (saith he) doe only afford their Ministry for the forgiveness of finnes, they doe not exercise the authority of any power. Neither doe they forgive sins in their Name, but in the Name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghost. Lombard, called the Master of the Sentences, and of School-divinity, disputing this Question, and shewing diverse Opinions about it, determines thus, That God only doth remit, and retain sins, and that yet God hath given power to the Church to bind and loose. But that God himself doth bind and loose one way, and the Church another way. That God by himself alone doth forgive sinne, so as to cleanse the soul from staine, and to free it from the guilt of eternall death. That he hath not given this power to Priests, to whom yet he hath given power to loose and bind, that is, to declare men to be loosed, or bound. Whence our Lord first by himselfe made the Leper sound, and then sent him to the Priests, that they might declare him to be clean.

And hence he inferres, that a Minister of the Gospell hath such power in remitting or retaining sins, as the Priest in the Law had in cleansing a Leper. The Priest was said to make the Leper clean, or unclean, (so the words are in the Originall, Levit. 13.) when he

licus, sicut olim legalis in illis, qui contaminati erant Leprosâ, quæ peccatum signat. — Et in remittendis, vel in retinendis culpis id juris acque officii habent Ecclesiastici sacerdotes, quod olim habebant sub lege legales in curandis leprosis. Hi ergo peccata dimittunt, vel retinent, dum dimissa à Deo, vel retenta judicant & ostendunt. Lomb. Ibid.

Nunc videamus utrum peccata donet Spiritus. Sed hinc dubitari non potest, cum ipse Dominus dixerit, Accipite Spiritum S. quorum remiseritis peccata, remissa erunt. Ecce quia per Spiritum S. peccata donantur. Homines autem in remissionem peccatorum ministeriū suum exhibent, non jus alicujus potestatis exercent. Neque enim in suo, sed in Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus S. nomine peccata dimituntur. Amb. de Spir. S. lib. 3. cap. 19.

Ecce quàm varia à doctoribus traduntur super his, & in hac tantâ varietate quid erit tenendum? Hoc sanè dicere ac sentire possumus, quòd solus Deus dimittit peccata, & retinet; & tamen ecclesiæ contulit potestatem ligandi, & solvendi. Sed aliter ipse solvit, & ligat, aliter ecclesia. Ipse enim per se tantum ita dimittit peccatum, quòd & animam mundat ab interiori maculâ, & à debito eternæ mortis solvit. Non autem hoc sacerdotibus concessit, quibus tamen tribuit potestatem solvendi, & ligandi, i. ostendendi homines ligatos vel solutos. Unde Dominus leprosum sanat prius per se restituit; deinde ad sacerdotes misit, quorum judicio ostenderetur mundatus. Lombard. lib. 4. dist. 18. lit. d. 6. & c.

In solvendis ergo culpis, vel retinendis ita operatur sacerdos Evangelicæ

— Et in remittendis, vel in retinendis culpis id juris acque officii habent Ecclesiastici sacerdotes, quod olim habebant sub lege legales in curandis leprosis. Hi ergo peccata dimittunt, vel retinent, dum dimissa à Deo, vel retenta judicant & ostendunt. Lomb. Ibid.

did pronounce and declare him to be clean or unclean. So *Ministers remit, or retain finnes, when they pronounce and declare that sins are remitted, or retained of God.* And in this *Lombard* followed *Hierome*, who (as his words cited by *Lombard* doe shew) by this very similitude of the Leviticall Priest, dealing with a Leper, illustrates and sets forth the manner how a Minister doth now remit, or retain sins. Thus then I hope it may sufficiently appear, that in this point both Scriptures and Fathers are for us, and not against us, as the *Marquess* would have it.

Marq: pag.
63. & 64.

We hold, that we ought to confesse our sins unto our ghostly Father; this ye deny, saying, that ye ought not to confesse your sins but unto God alone. This we prove by Scripture, Mat. 3. 5. 6. Then went out Jerusalem, and all Judea, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their finnes. *This confession was no generall confession, but in particular, as appeares, Acts 19. 18. 19.* And many that beleaved, came and confessed, and shewed their deeds. *The Fathers as firme the same, &c.*

Answ.

For Confession of Sinnes, Protestants doe not say, that they ought not to confesse to any but God onely, though they hold that ordinarily it sufficeth to confesse onely unto God, and that there is no necessity of confessing to any other; whereas they of the Church of *Rome* will have it necessary for every one man to confesse unto a Priest all his deadly finnes, (and such indeed are all finnes whatsoever without the mercy of God in Christ, *Rom. 6. 23. Gal. 3. 10.*) which by diligent examination he can find out, together with all the severall circumstances, whereby they are aggravated. Thus hath the Councell of *Trent* decreed it. And nothing will suffice to procure one, that is Baptized, remission of Sins, without this Confession either in *Re*, actually performed, or in

Concil. Trident.
Sess. 14. cap. 5.
Ex can. 6, 7, 8.
Bell. de Penit. lib. 3. c. 20.

Promissio de remittendis peccatis, iis qui continentur Deo peccata sua, non videtur ulla exare in divinis literis.
Bell. de penit. lib. 3. cap. 4. Sess. At solutio.

Voto, in desire, as *Bellarmino* doth expound it. Who also stickes not to say, that in all the Scripture there seems not to be any promise of forgiveness of finnes, made to those that confesse their sins unto God. Which is a most impudent Assertion. For *David* having said, *I acknowledged my sinne unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid: I said I will confesse my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sinne:* he addes immediately,
For

for this shall every one that is godly make his prayer unto thee, &c. *Psal.* 32. 5, 6. Besides * *Aquinas* and *Bonaventure*, two prime Schoolemen, hold that under the Law it was not (ordinarily) required of people to confesse in particular unto a Priest. *Bonaventure* also cites *Austine*, saying, *Oblatio sacrificiorum fuit confessio peccatorum*. The offering of sacrifices, was the confession of sinnes; whence hee inferreth, that therefore it seemes there was no other confessing of sinnes, but the offering of Sacrifices.

For those two places of Scripture cited by the Marquesse, neither they, nor any other doe speake of such a confession as they of the Church of *Rome* doe contend for. *Bellarmino* holds that their Sacramentall confession (as they call it, viz. that confession which they make a part of the Sacrament of penance) was not instituted till after *Christ's* Resurrection; and therefore he sayes, it is no marvell, if (as *Ambrose* observes) we reade of *Peter's* teares, but not of his confession. That the *Jewes* therefore, when they were baptized of *John*, confessed their sinnes, *Mat.* 3. 5, 6. is not enough to prove that confession, which we now dispute of, although it did appeare that the confession there spoken of, was a particular confession, which yet appeares not. *Cardinall Cajetane* saith it was but a generall confession. Neither indeed in probability could it be any more; for how should *John* have been able to heare such multitudes, as came unto him to be baptized (*Jerusalem*, and all *Judea*, and all the region round about *Jordan*, *Mat.* 3. 5.) confesse all their sinnes in particular? That it was no generall confession, but in particular, the Marquesse saith appeares by *Affs* 19. 18, 19. But if this confession spoken of *Affs* 19. were in particular, doth it follow, that therefore the other mentioned, *Mat.* 3. was so also? I see no force at all in this consequence, the confessions being made by severall persons, at severall times, and upon severall occasions. * *Cajetan* indeed doth parallell these two places together, but so as that he maketh them both

* *Aquin.* in suppl. quæst. 6. art. 2 ad. 3. *Bonav.* lib. 4. dist. 17. art. 1. qu. 2.

Ergo videtur quod non fuerit ibi alia confessio, quam oblatio. *Bon.* v. ibid.

Bell. de Penitent. lib. 3. cap. 20.

Cajet. in Aff. 19. 18.

* *Quemadmodum ad Baptismum Joannis concurrant*

reabant confidentes peccata sua, ita modo describuntur confidentes facta sua, procul dubio in genere, aut publica; neutra enim fuit confessio sacramentalis; sed professio penitentiae vix præteritæ. *Cajet. in Aff.* 19.

to speake of a generall confession, or a confession onely of such sinnes as were publick and notorious. Neither of them (hee saith) was a sacramentall confession, but onely a profession that they did repent of their life past. However, these places of Scripture can make nothing for Popish confession, which is injoynd, and forced, as without which (they say) salvation is not to be expected; but this which the Scriptures here speake of, was voluntary and free, the persons that confessed, did it of their own accord. The Popish confession is auricular (as it is called) secret, in the eare of a Priest; this appeares to have been open and publick. The Popish confession is a particular enumeration of all known sinnes; this if it were of any particular sinnes at all (as that mentioned *Acts* 19. may seeme to have been) yet onely of such as more especially did trouble their conscience, as may be collected from *Acts* 19. 20. and in such a case to confesse not onely unto God, but also unto men, and especially unto Ministers, Protestants doe not condemne, but hold requisite; onely they condemne that manner of confession, which in the Church of *Rome* is maintained and practised. And no marvell, seeing some of the

Roman Church themselves have shewed a great dislike of it. *Beatus Rhenanus*, a man of great learning, and never (that I know) withdrawing from the communion of the Church of *Rome*, speakes of the Romish confession as a thing but of late devised, and by himselfe little observed. Hee cites also one *Grilerius*, whom he calles a grave and holy Divine, that was a long time Preacher at *Strasbourg*; who (hee saith) did often testifie among his friends, that according to the late Roman dictates, it is impossible to confesse, and thereupon did write a

Booke in the *German* tongue, which he intituled, *Of the disease of confession*, then which disease (saith *Rhenanus*) they that are troubled with it, deny that any is more grievous.

For the Fathers cited by the Marquesse, the supposed *Clement*, whatsoever he say, need not much trouble us; the Epistles going

Ceterum Thomas ab Aquino, & Scotus, homines nimium arguti, confessionem hodie talem reddiderunt, ut Joannes ille Grilerius gravis ac sanctus theologus, qui tot annis Argentorati concionatus est, apud amicos suos saepe testatus sit, juxta illorum deuterotes impossibile esse confiteri. — Proinde motus fuit ut libellum ederet in lingua Germanica, cui titulum fecit, De morbo confessionis, quo negabant esse tristere, qui eo tenebantur: B. Rhen. in Tertull. de Patient.

ing under his name, are suspected, and scrupled at by *Bellarmino* himselfe in his Booke of Ecclesiasticall Writers : and therefore (it seemes) he thought it not meete to alledge his authority in this point, as the Marquesse doth. *Origen* also is cited li. 3. a strange citation ; I suppose it should be in *Leuit. Hom. 3.* for thence *Bellarmino* doth fetch a testimony to prove their confession. But when as *Chemnitius* alledged something out of those Homilies upon *Leuiticus* against Popish Traditions, ascribing them unto *Cyrill* (as also the *Rhemists* doe, adding that some say they are *Origens*) *Bellarmino* answers with disdain, that those Homilies are not *Cyrills*,

Bell. de Pæn. lib. 3. cap. 7.

Rhem. in Iob. 20. 23.

but *Origens*, or some others hee could not tell whose, who did destroy the Letter of the Scripture, that he might establish my-
ricall senses out of his own head : and that therefore those Homilies are of no great authority. But were the authority of those Homilies never so great, and unquestion-

Respondeo, Homilias illas in *Leuiticum* non esse *B. Cyrilli*, sed *Origenis*, vel nescio cuius alterius, qui passim literam destruit, ut mysticos sensus è capite suo statuat. Proinde Homilias istas non esse magnæ authoritatis. *Bell. de verb. Dei lib. 4. cap. 11.*

able, I see not how they make any thing for that confession, which our adversaries maintaine, and wee impugn. *Hom. 3.*

* *Origen* (or who ever was the author)

saith that if wee prevent *Satan*, and accuse our selves, we shall escape the malice of *Satan*, who is our adversary, and our accuser. But to whom we should accuse our selves, by confessing our sins, this Author shews not. *Bellarmino* indeed saith, that hee speakes of confessing

* Si ergo in vitâ præueniamus eis, & ipsi nostri accusatores simus, nequitiam diaboli inimici nostri, & accusatoris effugiemus: Sic enim & alibi Prophetæ dicit, Dic tu iniquitates tuas prior, ut iustificeris. *Orig. in Leuit. Hom. 3.*

unto a Priest ; but in the words (as *Bellarmino* himselfe doth cite them) there is neither Priest, nor any other, to whom confession of sinne should be made, expressed. And farre more congruous it is to understand it so, that as *Satan* doth accuse us unto God (as he accused *Iob*, though falsely, *Iob 1.* and *2.* And see *Revel. 12. 10.*) So we should prevent him by accusing our selves, and confessing our sinnes unto God also. Indeed *Hom. 2.* that author doth speake of confessing sinne unto a Priest, but that is onely in some speciall case, when sinne doth lie so fore upon the conscience, That *

* a sinner doth wash his bed with his chrymis stratum suum, & sinit ei lachrymæ fuz panes die ac nocte, &c. *Orig. Hom. 2. in Leuit.*

* Cum lavat peccator in la-

teares, and his teares are his meat day & night. In which case, no Protestants (that I know) but hold it good and requisite to lay open the malady to such as are most likely to apply a remedy. Thus also seemes that to be understood, which the Marquesse bringeth

Erat enim gaudens cum gaudentibus, & flens cum flentibus. Siquidem quotiescunque illi aliquis ob percipiendam poenitentiam lapsus suos confessus esset, ita flebat, ut & illum flere compelleret. *Paulin. in vita Ambrosi.*

out of *Paulinus* writing the life of *Ambrose*, (for that is meant by the quotation, which is mis-printed, *Amb. Ex Paulino*) viz. that *Ambrose* sat to heare confession. *Paulinus* saith of *Ambrose*, that he would rejoyce with those that did rejoyce, and weep with those that wept. And that when-

soever any came to confesse their sinnes unto him, hee would so weepe, as to constrain the party confessing to weepe also. The Marquesse further citeth *Ambros. Orat. in muliere peccatrice*; it should be, I presume, in *mulierem peccatricem*; but I finde no such peece among *Ambrose* his workes. However, if *Ambrose* any where doth say (as hee is cited) *confesse freely to the Priest the hidden sinnes of thy soule*, yet it doth not appeare that hee doth require this otherwise then in the case before mentioned, *Irenaeus* also is cited *lib. 1. cap. 9.* and *Tertull. lib. de Penitent.* Now these speak of publike confession, and so speake not to our Adversaries purpose: the very word which they use for confession, viz. *Exomologesis*, is commonly so used for that confession, which is publike. *Irenaeus* speakes of some Women, who had followed *Marcus* an Heretick, but when they were converted to the Church, they confessed their wickednesse; their sinne being open and scandalous, they made open and publike confession of it. It's true, *Irenaeus* saith that those women confessed how they had beene defiled by *Marcus*, and how much they had loved him, which was more then any could have known but by their own confession. Yet this hinders not, but that the confession was publike; they first confessing publicly that which was publicly known, to shew the sincerity of their Repentance the more, might proceede to confesse also that which was secret, yet was a concomitant of that which was publike, viz. their adhering unto the Heretick. *Tertullian* also clearly speakes of publike confession, that which was made *inter Patres atque conservos*, amongst Brethren and fellow-servants, so that

Agit de poenitentia publicâ, quam exomologesin vocat. *Pamel. in Tertull. de Pen.*

Tertull. de Pen. cap. 1. et 2.

the whole body would grieve for the paine of one member. * *The body* (saith he) *cannot rejoyce at the paine of one member. It must needs, all sorrow with it, and labour together for a remedy.* Tertullian makes no mention of secret confession of sins, as † *Rhenanus* observes, who conceiveth that secret confession did arise from publick confession, people of their owne accord confessing secret sinnes secretly, as they used to confesse open sins openly. For (saith he) *We no where read that this (secret confession) was enjoined; he means by the Ancients.*

One Father more there is, whom the Marquesse here citeth, namely *Chrysostome*, lib. 3. de *Sacerdot.* So *Bellarmino* having alledged something out of the former book of *Chrysostome*, bids see also the third book. But (no doubt) if there had been any thing more for *Bellarmino*'s purpose in the third book then in the second, he would have been so good, as to have set it before us. Now the very words of *Chrysostome*, as *Bellarmino* cites out of lib. 2. de *sacerd.* do shew that he speaks not of a necessity lying upon all to confesse all their sinnes to a Minister, but onely that *Christiani qui laborant*, Christians that are in a perplexed estate have need of this remedy. Having thus shewed that the Fathers testifie nothing for Popish confession, I shall shew how they testifie against it.

And to begin with him that was last mentioned, *Chrysostome* is most copious in this kind. *Why art thou ashamed* (saith he) *and dost blush to confesse thy sinnes? Dost thou speak to a man, that he may upbraid thee? Dost thou confesse to thy fellow servants, that he may * insult over thee? To thy Lord, to him that hath a care of thee: to him that is kind, to the Physician thou dost shew thy wound.* Here he takes it for granted, that there is (ordinarily) no necessity of confessing to any but to God onely. So againe, *Art thou ashamed* (saith he) *to say that thou hast sinned? Confesse then daily in thy * prayer.* For doe I say, confesse to thy fellow servant, who may reproach thee? No, confesse unto God, who doth cure thee. Diverse such sayings hath this Father, most plain and pregnant

* Non potest corpus de unitas membrorum vexatione lætum agere. Condoleat universum, & ad remedium conlaboret necesse est. Tertull. Ibid.

† Non aliam ob causam complurium hic testimonio usi sumus, quam ne quis admiretur Tertullianum de clancularia ista admissorum confessione nihil locutum; quæ quantum conijcimus, nata est ex ista exomologesi per ultroneam hominum pietatem, ut occultorum criminum esset & exomologesi occulta. Rhen. in Tert. de Penit. Ubi addit, Nec enim usquam præceptum esse legimus.

Bell. de Penit.

l. 3. c. 9. Vide

etiam lib. 3. de

Sacerdotio.

Chrysost. con. 4.

de Lazar.

* Or translate

thee ἀπομ-

πέσθ.

Chrysost. in

Psalm 50.

* ἐν τῇ εὐχα-

ριστί: some read

ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ

σου, in thy soul.

Bell. de Pen.
l. 3. c. 15.

nant for our purpose ; *Bellarmino* with all his art and all his industry was not able to give a satisfactory answer to them. He saith that *Chrysostome* spake onely of publick Confession, not of private ; onely of that which is made in the open Congregation, not of that which is made to a Priest in secret. But it is evident that *Chrysostome* speaks against the necessity of confessing to

Dicito quocidiè in animâ tuâ. *Chrysost.*
in *Psal.* 50. ut legit *Bellarmino*.

Cogitatione fiat delictorum exquisitio—Solut te Deus confitentem videat. *Chrysost.* hom. de Pen. & Confess.

any but onely unto God. He bids *Confesse* in thy soul. Make confession in thy thought. Let God onely see thee confessing. Such confession as this, man hath nothing to do with either in publick or in private. *Bellarmino* answers, that in these places *Chrysostome*

doth speak of confession, not as it hath reference to the Priests absolution, but as it hath reference to shame and confusion : and in this latter respect he saith *Chrysostome* doth well admonish, that it is not necessary to confesse unto man either in publick or in private, but that it sufficeth to confesse with sorrow and tears unto God onely. But here *Bellarmino* (a thing not usuall with him) doth contradict himself. For here he granteth that to confesse only unto God is enough to work shame ; yet in another place he saith, *That shame iseth not to be feared in that confession, which is made onely unto God.* And againe, *Shamefac'dnesse hath no place in that confession which is made onely unto God.* These assertions, as they agree not with the truth, see

Confusio timeri non solet in confessione, quæ soli Deo fit. *Bell. de Pen.* lib. 3. cap. 3.

Verecundia non habet locum in confessione, quæ soli Deo fit. *Bell. de Pen.* lib. 3. cap. 6.

Exr. 9.6. so neither do they agree with the answer that here *Bellarmino* giveth unto *Chrysost.* Where as *Bellarmino* saith, that *Chrysost.* speaketh not of confession, as having reference to the Priests absolution, it is easily granted, there being (ordinarily) no necessity of any such absolution. *Chrysostome* willet a man to confesse, though but in his heart, unto God, assuring him that thereby he shall obtain Gods absolution : and what need then of any others absolution ? Except in some speciall case, viz. for the quieting of a troubled conscience, and that one may the better enjoy the comfort of Gods absolution. Thus for *Chrysostome* : *Ausine* also doth shew the no-necessity of confessing unto men, which still must be understood excepting some particular case, wherein it may be requisite,

quire. *What have I to doe (saith he) With men, that they should hear my confessions, as if they could heal all my diseases?* Bellarmine takes it in disdain, that these words of *Austine* should be alledged against their confession. This (he saith) is nothing else but to delude the simple: For that whosoever reads *Austines* Confessions cannot but know, that he speaks not of Sacramentall Confession, but of the Confession of sinnes past, and forgiven by Baptisme; which Confession was made to that end, that thereby the mercy of God might be seen, and praised. But *Austines* words are of more force then thus to be evaded. We willingly grant that *Austine* speaks not of Sacramentall Confession, there being indeed no such Confession to be spoken of, as they call Sacramentall; no such, I say, truly so called; and so much these very words of *Austine* doe sufficiently testifie. For Sacramentall Confession (as they call it) is a Confession necessarily to be made unto a Priest, or else no remission of sin (they say) committed after Baptisme can be obtained, but *Austine* shewes that ordinarily Confessing unto men is not necessary. Neither is it so, that *Austine* in his book of Confessions doth only speak of his sins which he had committed before he was Baptized. For in that tenth Book, where he hath the words before cited, he speaketh of sinnes, which he was guilty of long after his Baptisme, yea even then when he was writing his Confessions. As namely, * impure Dreames, and nocturnall pollutions; as also excess in Eating. Diverse other particulars doth he also confesse, saying that his life was full of such failings, and that all his hope was onely in Gods exceeding great mercy. To this purpose also, † *Ambrose*, who speaking of *Peter*, saith, *I find not what he spake, I find that he*

somnis autem non solum usque ad delectationem, sed etiam usque ad consensionem, factumque simillimum. Et tantum valet imaginis illusio in animâ meâ, & in carne meâ, ut dormienti falsâ visâ persuadeant, quod vigilanti vera non possunt. — Quid adhuc sim in hoc genere mali mei, dixi bono Domino meo, &c. *Aug. Confess. lib. 10. cap. 30.* Crapula non nunquam surrepit sermo tuo, &c. *Ibid. c. 31.* Et talibus vita mea plena est, & una spes mea in magnâ valde misericordiâ tuâ. *Ibid. c. 35.* † Non invenio quid dixerit, invenio quod flevit. — Lavant lachrymæ delictum, quod voce pudor est confiteri. *Amb. in Luc. 22.*

Quid mihi ergo est cum hominibus, ut audiant confessiones meas, quasi ipsi sanaturi sint omnes languores meos? *Aug. Confess. lib. 10. cap. 3.*

Hoc nihil est aliud nisi simplicibus imponere. Nemo enim libros illos legit, qui nesciat, Confessionem, de quâ loquitur Augustinus, non esse Sacramentalem, sed confessionum peccatorum præteritorum, & per baptismum dimissorum, &c. *Bellarmin. de Penit. lib. 3. cap. 20.*

* Adhuc vivunt in memoriâ meâ talium rerum imagines, & occurrant mihi vigilanti quidem carentis viribus, in

wept. And hence he inferreth, that tears may procure pardon of sin, though no verball Confession be made of it.

Beil. de Penit.
l. 3. c. 20.

To this testimony of *Ambrose*, *Bellarmino* answers, that as then Sacramentall Confession was not instituted, and therefore 'tis no marvell, if we doe not read of *Peters* confession. And 'tis very true that Sacramentall Confession neither then had, nor at all hath any divine institution. Again *Bellarmino* sayes, that Tears (of which *Ambrose* speaketh) containe a kind of Confession in them. This indeed is true in respect of God, who knowes the heart and affection from whence Tears proceed: and therefore *David* saith that the Lord had heard the voice of his weeping, *Psal.* 6.8. which shewes, that as the Tongue by speaking, so the Eyes by weeping have a voice, which God doth hear. But what is this unto men, who by tears alone, without words, can understand little? *Bellarmino* grants that Tears are sufficient in that Confession, which is made unto God, who knoweth all things. Well, and *Ambrose* saith that Tears may suffice to procure pardon; and therefore no necessity of any other Confession then what is made unto God only.

Beil. Ibid.

Confessionis autem causam addidit, dicens quia fecisti: autorem scilicet huius universitatis Dominum esse confessus, nulli alii docens confitendum, quam qui fecit olivam fructiferam, &c. *Hilar.* in *Psal.* 51. v. ult.

In seculum, & in seculum seculi misericordiae spes est, sed confessio tantum in seculum, non etiam in seculum seculi. Non enim confessio peccatorum nisi in huius seculi tempore est. *Hilar. Ibid.*

Thus also *Hilary* is clear for the sufficiency of Confession made onely unto God, saying that *David* teacheth us to confesse only unto him, who hath made the Olive fruisfull. It's true, the Confession that *David* there (viz. *Psal.* 52.9.) speaks of, is the Confession of Praise and of Thanksgiving; but *Hilary* understands it of the confession of sins, saying, that *David* does not say, *I will confesse unto thee for ever and ever*, as immediately before he said, *I trust in the mercy of God for ever and ever*; but *I will confesse unto thee for ever*, or whiles he lived, *in seculum*, because onely in the time of this life here are finnes to be confessed. So that however *Hilary* did mistake *David's* meaning, through the Ambiguity of the word *Confitebor*, i. e. I will confesse, or I will give thanks, yet he clearly expresseth his own opinion, that it is sufficient to confesse unto God only.

And this opinion was maintained by some in the Roman Church

Church above a thousand years after Christ. For Peter Lombard (who was above 1100 years after Christ) disputing this point touching Confession, confesseth, That some thought it sufficient to confesse onely unto God. This Opinion was not accounted

Quibusdam visum est sufficere, si soli Deo fiat confessio. Lomb. lib. 4. dist. 17. lit. d.

a Heresie by the Church of Rome it self untill the time of Pope Innocent the third, about 1200 years after Christ, when in the Councell of Lateran it was decreed necessary to confesse unto a Priest, and not unto God only. And therefore Bonaventura, who lived a little after that Councell, speaking of those who held it sufficient to confesse only unto God, saith,

that if any now were of that opinion, he were an Heretick, because the contrary was determined in a Generall Councell, but before that determination that Opinion was no Heresie. Thus then we see by the acknowledgment of the Romish Doctors themselves, that the necessity of Sacramentall Confession (as they call it) is not fetched either from Scriptures, or Fathers, but from Pope Innocent the Third, and the Councell that was in his time.

Si quis esset modò hujus opinionis, esset hæreticus judicandus, quoniam in concilio generassi hoc determinatum est sub Innocentio tertio; sed ante hanc determinationem hoc non erat hæresis. Bonav. in 8ent. lib. 4. dist. 17. num. 50.

we see by the acknowledgment of the Romish Doctors themselves, that the necessity of Sacramentall Confession (as they call it) is not fetched either from Scriptures, or Fathers, but from Pope Innocent the Third, and the Councell that was in his time.

To conclude this point touching Confession, I will only adde one Argument for Confutation of the Romish Doctrine in this particular. Such Confession as they of the Church of Rome require, viz. a particular enumeration of all mortall sins, with all their severall aggravating circumstances, is not possible. And therefore neither is it of divine institution. Bellarmine answers, that by this reason it is impossible to confesse unto God; for that we hold, that Confession made unto God must be intire, not of some sins onely, but of all. And if we say, that it is sufficient to confesse unto God all, so farre forth as we can come to the knowledge of them, adding that of David, *Psal. 19. 13. Who can understand his errors? Lord cleanse me from my secret faults*: Bellarmine saith, that to confesse thus to a Priest doth suffice also. But, I say, this answer will not satisfie; for there is not the same reason of confessing unto God, and of confessing to a Priest, as they require it. God knoweth all our sinnes before we confesse, farre better then we our selves doe; onely we are to confesse unto him, to shew our selves humble and penitent. But our Adversaries say, that

Bell. de Penit. lib. 3. cap. 16.

Bell. de Panis.
lib. 3. cap. 2.

particular Confession must be made unto a Priest, because otherwise he cannot tell how to judge, so as either to remit sinnes, or to retain them. Now to this end it is not enough to confesse unto a Priest all that one can find out, but it is necessary to confesse absolutely all that one is guilty of. For otherwise how shall the Priest be able to judge of those sinnes which he knoweth not? If he cannot judge of those sins which are confessed, except they be confessed; then neither can he judge of those sins which are not confessed, because they are not confessed: there is the same reason for the one as for the other. If the Priest can judge of those sins, that are not confessed, by those that are confessed, then may he also, by hearing the confession of one or two sins, judge of all the rest, though no Confession be made of them. Thus the Confession which our Adversaries contend for, is either not possible, or at least not necessary.

Page. 64.

After Confession the Marquesse comes to workes of Supererogation, which they say a man may doe, *viz.* good works, more excellent then those, which the Law of God doth require. And that a man may doe such workes, the Marquesse proves, by *Mat. 19. 12. There be eunuches, that have made themselves eunuches for the Kingdome of Heaven: he that is able to receive it, let him receive it.*

This (the Marquesse saith) is more then a Commandement, as *S. Aug.* observes upon the place, *Ser. lib. de temp.* (it should be *Serm. 61. de temp.*) for of precepts it is not said, *Keep them who is able, but keep them absolutely.* I answer, it is true of generall precepts, such as concern all, they are to be kept absolutely by all; but for speciall precepts, which concern only some, they are only to be kept by those whom they do concern. And so those words, *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it,* are a precept, but limited and restrained, *viz.* unto some certain persons, who otherwise can, without inconvenience, live a single life; they are required to doe it, not as a thing simply necessary, but as necessary for them; not as a thing wherein perfection doth consist, but as a means whereby the better to draw towards perfection, *viz. To serve the Lord without distraction, 1 Cor. 7. 35.* Neither doe the Fathers (whom the Marquesse citeth) hold any such works of Supererogation, as the Romanists plead for, *viz.* works more

more excellent and perfect then those which the Law of God prescribeth. * *Ambrose* seemes to speake

more then the rest, and therefore it may be hee is put in the first place, though some that are cited, are more ancient then hee.

They that have fulfilled the precept (hee saith) *may say, Wee are unprofitable servants,*

wee have done what our duty was to doe. This the Virgin saith not, nor hee that sold his Goods, viz. to give to the poore.

* Qui præceptum impleverint, dicere possunt, Servi inutiles sumus, quod debuimus facere, fecimus. Hoc virgo non dicit; non dicit ille, qui bona sua vendidit. *Ambr. de viduis.*

Thus *Ambrose*; but have not these words need of a favourable interpretation? For will our adversaries themselves say, that there are any absolutely so perfect, as that they need not confesse unto God, that they are unprofitable servants? what they will say I cannot tell, but sure I am that Christs Disciples, who were as perfect as any others, were not so perfect. For even to them did Christ speake those words, *When yee shall have done all these things, which are commanded you, say, Wee are unprofitable servants, wee have done but what was our duty to doe. Luke 17. 10.* It may be our Adversaries will say, true, when they had done all things commanded them, they were to say, *we are unprofitable servants, &c.* but not when they had done more then was commanded them. But did they so? They left all indeed; and followed Christ; but did not Christ call them to it, and command them to doe it? In this therefore they did no more then their duty was to doe. We must distinguish therefore betwixt generall duties, and speciall duties. All were not bound to forsake all actually, as the Apostles did, and to follow Christ, because there was no generall precept for it; but the Apostles were bound to do it, because they had a speciall call and command from Christ, that did oblige them to it. Thus then *Ambroses* words must be understood, that in respect of a generall precept obliging all to the thing done, some may be said to doe more then their duty was to doe, though simply and absolutely they did not more. For if it were more for Gods glory to doe what they did, then not to doe it, they were bound to doe it. For else how did they love God with all their heart; and with all their soule, and with all their might? as all

* Virginitas non ex debito solvitur : neque enim per praeceptum expeditur, sed supra debitum offertur. *Origen. in cap. 15. ad Rom.*

are commanded to doe, *Deut. 5. 16.* * *Origen* is next cited, who saith that such as live in virginity, doe not that which is commanded, but above what is due. But the meaning is, that virginity is not a thing generally commanded, not a duty required of all ; yet to some, who have the gift, and are called of God to improve it to the greater advancement of his glory, it is a duty ; every one is bound to doe that, which doth make most for Gods glory, that being the end for which wee ought doe whatsoever wee doe. *1 Cor. 10. 31.*

Euseb. demonstr. Evang. l. 1. c. 8.

After *Origen* followes *Eusebius*, who saith, that in the Church of God two kinds of life are instituted ; one exceeding our nature, and the common course of life, not seeking marriage, nor offspring, nor substance, but addicted wholly to Gods worship. And this is the manner of a perfect life in Christianity. The other kind of life is more remisse, and humane, which is intangled in modest wedlock, and procreation of children, &c. To such belongeth the second degree of piety. Thus *Eusebius*, who yet is far from asserting such workes of supererogation as are now disputed of. We grant, that to live unmarried so as thereby the better and the more freely to serve God, is a life of more perfection then to live married, and so to be entangled with the affairs of the world. But we deny that they who so live unmarried, doe supererogate, i. e. that they not only do all that is commanded, but also over and above what is commanded. This neither doth *Eusebius* say, neither can it be proved.

Multi & ipsa superant mandata. *Chrys. hom. 8. de penit.*

Next comes *Chrysostome*, who may seeme to speake much, but indeed it is not much to the purpose. Hee saith that many doe exceede the Commandements. But how is that ? Not in respect of the whole latitude of the Commandements ; for (as *David* testifies) they are exceeding broad. *Psal. 119. 96.* It is therefore onely in respect of some outward act, which is not directly and precisely commanded. And thus, *Chrysostome* sayes that the Heathens, many of them, did exceede the Commandements ; and yet (I presume) our Adversaries will not ascribe

Nonne praecepta Dei adcolevia sunt, ut multi philosophica ratione illa excefferint ? *Chrys. Hom. 3 in 1. ad Corinth.*

any extraordinary perfection to the Heathens. The testimony then of *Chrysostome* makes but little for their works of supererogation, except they will acknowledge such workes to have been done by Heathens, many of which might forbear marriage; so the vestall Virgins did; and this was according to *Chrysostomes* manner of speech, to exceede the Commandements, namely to go beyond that, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*. But consider this (and so any other) Commandement in the full extent of it, as forbidding all wanton lookes, and all unchaste thoughts, *Mat. 5. 28. Job. 31. 1.* and so neither the Vestall nor the Popall Virgins, will finde any great cause of boasting.

The last Father here cited, is *Gregory* (*Nicen.* in the Mar-queses paper is to be blotted out, as superfluous, this here cited being not *Gregory Nissen.* but *Gregory* surnamed *the great*, Bishop of Rome) who saith, *The elect sometimes doe more then God hath vouchsafed to command.* For bodily

virginity is not commanded, but onely commended; for if it were commanded, then marriage would be a fault. And yet many live in virginity, and so performe more then the Commandement doth require of them. It is true, there is no precept directly commanding virginity, and in that respect they that live in virginity may be said to doe more

then the Commandement doth require of them. Yet if any have the speciall gift given of God, and see it a meanes whereby the more to glorifie God, then by consequence the precept of loving God with all our heart, and with all our soule, and with all our might, *Deut. 6. 5.* and of doing all to the glory of God, *1 Cor. 10. 31.* these precepts (I say) in such a case doe require virginity. But (alas!) what is all this that hath beene alledged both from Scriptures and Fathers, to prove workes of supererogation? to prove that men may not onely doe all that is commanded, but also more then is commanded? How will this consist with the Scriptures, which tell us, *There is not a just man upon earth that doth good, and sinneth not.* *Eccles. 7. 20.* In many things we offend all. *Jam. 3. 2.* If God shall contend with us, we cannot answer him one of a thousand, *Job 9. 3.* And doe

Greg. Moral. lib. 15. cap. 9. Electi nonnunquam plus student agere quam eis dignatus est Dominus jubere. Caris enim Virginitas nequaquam iussa est, sed laudata; nam si illa juberetur, conjugium jam culpa crederetur, & tamen multi virtute virginitatis pollent, ut plus impendant obsequio, quam acceperunt praecepto.

not the Fathers concur with the Scriptures in this? Then are

a Tunc iusti sumus, quando nos peccatores fateamur. Hieron. dial. advers. Pelag. lib. 1.

b Hæc hominibus sola perfectio, si imperfectos esse se noverint. Hieron. advers. Pelag. ad Crespionem.

c Hæc est perfectorum vera iustitia, ut nunquam præsumant se esse perfectos. Leo ser. 2. de Quadrag.

d Si de his divinitus districtè discutimur, quis inter hæc remanet salutis locus? quando & mala nostra pura mala sunt, & bona, quæ nos habere credimus, pura bona esse nequaquam possunt. Greg. Moral. lib. 35. cap. 16.

e Sciunt quippe (Sancti) quia omnis humana iustitia iniustitia esse deprehenditur, si divinitus districtè judicetur. Greg. Moral. l. 21. c. 17.

wee righteous (saith *a* Hierome) *when wee confesse our selves to be sinners.* And againe,

b *This is the onely perfection of men, that they know themselves to be imperfect.* So *c* Leo, *This is the true righteousness of those that are perfect, that they never presume them-*

selves to be perfect. Thus also *d* Gregory the great, *If God shall strictly examine us, what hope of salvation is there for us? when as our evill deeds, are simply evill, but the good deeds, which we suppose wee have, cannot be simply good.* And againe, *e* *The Saints know that all mans righteousness is found to be unrighteousness, if God doe strictly judge it.*

Page 64.

After workes of Supererogation, the Marquesse passeth to *Free-will*, saying that they hold that wee have *Free-will*, and that we deny it. But a question should be stated, before it be disputed; we do not deny, that we have *Free-will*, though wee deny that our will is so free, now in the estate of corrupt nature, as that wee have of our selves, any ability to that which is truly good. * *Calvin* allowes both the name of *Free-will*, and also the thing it selfe, so it be rightly understood; viz. that the will of man is free, as freedome is opposed to coercion, the will is so free, as that it cannot be compelled or constrained. But that the will is free as to be able of it selfe to chuse either good or

* Ego verò quantum ad vocem pertinet, adhuc profiteor, quòd in meà instituitur òe testatus sum, non ad eò me supersticiosum esse in verbis, ut

ejus causà velim contentionem aliquam movere, modò rei intelligentia sana maneat. Si coercionì opponitur libertas, liberum esse arbitrium, & fateor, & constanter assero; ac pro hæretico habeo, quisquis secus sentiat. Sed cum aliud prorsus vulgò concipiant, dum hoc epithetò hominis voluntati attributum vel legunt, vel audiunt, hæc causà est, cur mihi displiceat. Siquidem ad facultatem viresque referunt, nec impedire possis, quin simulac libera fuerit voluntas dicta, hæc pluribus imaginatio protinus in mentem veniat, habere igitur sub potestate suà bonum & malum; ut alterutrum eligere suapte virtute queat. *Calv. contra Pigh. de lib. arbit. pag. 215.* Semper autem testatus sum, me de nomine pugnare nolle, si hoc semel constitueretur, libertatem non ad potentiam, vel facultatem boni æquè ac mali eligendi, sed ad spontaneum morum & consensum referri debere. *Ibid. p. 229.* Causam mihi justam habere video, cur voculam opè sub atam è medio, ad quàm major propè mundi pars tanto periculo impingit. *Ibid. p. 215.*

evill]

evill, this is it that he contends against; and because many when they heare or read of *Free-will*, understand it in this sense, this made him wish that the very word were abandoned, many being so apt to stumble at it.

* *Chamier* a famous Protestant Writer, shewes that our Divines disputing against *Free-will*, doe not simply deny it, but in this sense, that the will is equally propense and indifferent to good and evill.

This is that, which they deny, and against which they bend their disputations. *Wee doe not make a question* (saith hee also) *whether the will be free; this wee have often testified, and must still repeat it, because of the importunity of our adversaries. This then is that which we question, what and how much that liberty of the will can availe in respect of that which is good. And againe, wee have protested* (saith hee) *that wee hold Free-will, though not such as the Pelagians held, nor as the Papists hold.*

Thus then wee hold, that since the fall of *Adam*, mans will is free to that which is evill, but to that which is good, it is not free, untill by the grace of Christ it be made free. *If the Sonne shall make you free* (saith our Saviour) *then yee shall be free indeed.* *Joh. 8.36.* But not till then. How should they be free to that which is good, who are dead in trespasses and finnes? as by nature all are. *Eph. 2. 1.* who are sold unto sinne; as the Apostle confesseth hee was so farre forth as hee was unregenerate, *Rom. 7. 14.* and that in him, that is, in his flesh (his corrupt nature) no good dwelled. *vers. 18.* who are the servants of sinne, as all are before their conversion, *Romans 6. 17.* In this respect *Luther* might well intitle his booke (as hee did) of *servile will*, rather then of *Free-will*, to shew that this *Free-will* is by nature the servant of sinne.

rum arbitrium verè esse peccati servum. *Cham. tom. 3. lib. 2. cap. 8. Sect. 9.*

* Quia vix aliâ nomine nominabatur lib. arbitrium, hinc nostrorum plurimarum contrariarum disputationes, vix negare funditus lib. arbitrium. Cum tamen certum sit omnino non negari nisi hoc sensu. Quod satis apparet ex earum disputationum serie, quibus hic scopus propositus est, ut hanc usam in bonum malumque æquam propensionem sive indifferentiam perpetuo impugnent. *Cham. tom. 3. lib. 3. ca. 1. Sect. 7.* Nostra nulla questio est, utrum sua sit arbitrio libertas, quod sæpe testatum sæpius repetendum est, propter adversariorum importunitatem. Quid ergo? Nempe quid quantumque ea valeat ad bonum voluntas, inquirimus. *Ibid. c. 14. Sect. 6.*

Nos protestati sumus tenere liberum arbitrium, & si non quale statuerant *Pelagiani*; non etiam quale statuerant *Papistæ.* *Ibid. cap. 17. Sect. 5.*

De servo arbitrio.
Indicans disputari in eo, illud Libe-

Quid enim boni operari potest perditus, nisi quantum fuerit à perditione liberatus? Nunquid libero voluntatis arbitrio? Et hoc absit. Nam libero arbitrio malè utens homo & se perdidit, & ipsum. Sicut enim qui se occidit, utique vivendo se occidit, sed se occidendo non vivit, nec seipsum rescitare potest cum occiderit: ita cum libero peccatur arbitrio, victore peccato amissum est liberum arbitrium. A quo enim quis devictus est, huic & servus additus est. Qualis, quæque potest servi additi esse libertas, nisi quando peccare eum delectat? Ac per hoc ad peccandum liber est, qui peccat servus est. Unde ad justè faciendum liber non erit, nisi à peccato liberatus esse justitiæ coeperit servus. *Aug. Enchir. cap. 30.*

Wherefore hee shall not be free to doe righteously, unless hee be made free from sinne hee shall become the servant of righteousness.

Sed ista libertas ad benefaciendum unde erit homini addito, & vendito, nisi redimar ille, cujus illa vox est? Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc verè liberi eritis? Quod antequam fieri in homine incipiat, quomodo quisquam de libero arbitrio in bono glorietur opere, qui nondum liber est ad operandum bene? *Ibid.*

Amittitur liberum arbitrium, non cum perit, quod fieri non potest, sed cum à diabolo captivatur; quomodo dicuntur amissa, quæ tempore belli in potestatem hostium veniunt. *Bell. de grat. lib. arb. l. 5. c. 30.*

S. Augustine in many places is as cleare, and expresse, for this which wee hold, as can be imagined. *For what good (saith he) can lost man worke, but so farre forth as hee is freed from that lost condition? can hee by Free-will? No such matter. For man using Free-will amisse, lost both himselfe and it. For as hee that killeth himselfe, doth by living kill himselfe, but by killing himselfe hee ceaseth to live: So when by Free-will man did sinne, sinne getting the victory, Free-will was lost. For of Whom a man is overcome, of the same hee is brought in bondage. (2 Pet. 2. 19.) What, I pray, can be the freedome of one that is brought into bondage, except when it doth delight him to sinne? And by this hee is free to sinne, who is the servant of sinne. Wherefore hee shall not be free to doe righteously, unless hee be made free from sinne hee shall become the servant of righteousness. And presently after. But that freedome, which is to doe well, how shall man being in bondage, and sold under sinne have, except hee redeeme him, who hath said, If the Sonne shall make you free, then you shall be free indeed? Before this begin to be done in man, how can any glory of Free-will in a good worke, seeing hee is not yet free to doe well?*

Bellarmino brings in the first peece of this saying of *Augustine*, and answers, that *Free-will* is lost, not in that it is quite abolished, but in that it is held captive by the Devill; as things are said to be lost, which in time of war are in the power of the enemy.

But what is this but even to yeeld us that which wee contend for? For if *Free-will* be so lost, as to be held captive by Satan, then surely the will, untill it be set free by Christ, is not free in respect of that which is truly good, and accompanying salvation.

This.

This will (saith Augustine) which is free in things that are evill, because it is delighted in things that are evill, is therefore not free in things that are good, because it is not made free.

And againe, *Without the Grace of God the will cannot be free, seeing it is subject to lusts that doe overcome it, and bring it into bondage.*

And again, *How dare miserable men be proud of Free-will, before they are made free?* These, and many other Sentences of this Father, are so full for our purpose, that our Divines might well professe (as they doe) that in this point they fully accord with *Augustine*. But I will adde the testimonies of some other Fathers besides him.

Ibid. pag. 227. Totam de libero arbitrio doctrinam Augustini Calvinus probavit, nos etiam probamus, dummodo æstimetur ex ejus disputationibus contra Pelagianos. *Cham. Tom. 3. lib. 3. cap. 18. sect. 5.*

While sin reignes (saith Fulgentius) a man hath Free-will, but free without God, not free under God, that is, free from Righteousnesse, not free under Grace, and so most ill, and slavishly free, because not made free by the free gift of God shewing mercy. This he proves by Rom. 6. 22. and addes, Therefore he cannot serve Righteousnesse, who is free from Righteousnesse; because so long as he is the servant of sinne, he is onely able to serve him. To the same effect also speaks Bernard, By I know not what evill and wonderfull means (saith he) the will being changed by sinne, and made worse, doth bring a necessity upon it selfe, so that nei-
fit ille&a, excludere necessitatem. Est n. necessitas hæc quodammodo voluntaria. — Vo-
luntas enim est, quæ se cum esset libera, servam fecit peccati, peccato. assentiendo: volun-
tas nihilominus est, quæ se sub peccato tenet voluntariè serviendo. Bernard. Serm. 81.
in Cant.

Sed hæc voluntas, quæ libera est in malis, quia delectatur malis, ideo libera in bonis non est, quia liberata non est. Aug. ad Bonifac. contra duas epist. Pelagian. cap. 3.

Sine gratia Dei non potest esse libera voluntas, cum cupiditatibus vincentibus & vincientibus subdita sit. Aug. epist. 144.

*Ut quid miseri homines audent super-
bire de libero arbitrio, antequam libe-
rentur? Aug. de Spir. & lit. c. 30.*

*Hinc illa, quam uni Augustino, præ
aliis tribuo, veræ sanæque doctrinæ
perspicua, certa, exactaque explicatio:
hinc & ille consensus, quem illi nobis-
cum esse glorior. Calv. contra Pigh.
pag. 225.*

*Augustinum a'ervi prorsus esse no-
strum. Ibid. pag. 227.* Totam de libero arbitrio doctrinam Augustini Calvinus probavit, nos etiam probamus, dummodo æstimetur ex ejus disputationibus contra Pelagianos. *Cham. Tom. 3. lib. 3. cap. 18. sect. 5.*

Regnante peccato habet liberum arbitrium, sed liberum sine Deo, non liberum sub Deo, i. e. liberum justitiæ, non liberum sub gratiâ, & ab hoc pessimè atque serviliter liberum, quia non gratuito miserentis Dei munere liberatû. (Probat ex Rom. 6. 22. atque addit) Servire igitur justitiæ non potest, quia justitiæ liber est; quia quamdiu est peccati servus, non nisi ad serviendum peccato reperitur idoneus. Fulgent. ad Pet. Diacon. cap. 19.

*Nescio quo pravo & miro modo ipsa
sibi voluntas peccato quidem in deterius mutata, necessitatem facit, ut nec
necessitas, cum sit voluntaria, excusare
valeat voluntatem, nec voluntas, cum*

ther necessity, being voluntary, can excuse the Will, nor the will, being imited, can exclude necessity. For it is after a sort a voluntary necessity. — For it is the Will, which when it was free, made it self the servant of sinne, by consenting unto sinne; neverthelesse it is the will, which keeps it self under sin, by serving it willingly. He shewes how the will is free, being captivated by sin, so free as that it sinneth willingly, yet not so free, as that it can refrain from sin, seeing it hath made it selfe the servant of sinne, and hath brought upon it

Ira anima misero quodam & malo modo sub hac voluntaria quâdam ac malè liberâ necessitate & ancilla tenetur, & libera; ancilla propter necessitatem, libera propter voluntatem: & quod magis mirum magisque miserum est, eo rea quo libera, eoque ancilla quo rea, ac per hoc eo ancilla quo libera. Bern. Ibid.

Nunc verò nusquam exitus misero pater, quem & voluntas (ut dixi) inexcusabilem, & incorrigibilem necessitas facit. Bern. Ibid.

Est verò quam magis ei congruere arbitror libertatem, quam dicere possumus à necessitare, eò quòd necessarium voluntario contrarium esse videtur. Bern. de grat. & lib. arb.

Siquidem non cogitur, non exorquetur. Est quippe voluntatis, non necessitatis. Nec negat se, nec præbet cuiquam nisi ex voluntate. Alioquin si compelli valet invitus, violentus est, non voluntarius. Ubi autem voluntas non est, nec consensus. Non est enim consensus nisi voluntarius. Ubi ergo consensus, ibi voluntas. Porro ubi voluntas, ibi libertas. Et hoc est quod dici puto liberum arbitrium. Bern. Ibid.

self a necessity of sinning. Thus (saith he) the soul, after a wonderfull, and evil manner, under this voluntary and ill free necessity is both held in bondage, and also is free: in bondage, because of necessity, free, because of will. And which is more wonderfull, and more miserable, it is therefore guilty, because it is free, and therefore in bondage, because guilty, and so consequently therefore in bondage because free. He addes a little after, Now there is no escape for miserable man, (by his own free-will, or any power in himself) whom (as I have said) both the will doth make inexcusable, and also necessity doth make incorrigible. Elsewhere indeed Bernard seems to make the wil perpetually, and of its own nature free from necessity, for that necessary and voluntary seeme to be contrary one to the other. But by necessity he means co-action and compulsion: For speaking of consent, he saith, It is not compelled, it is not extorted; for it is of Will, not of necessity. It neither denies it selfe, nor affords it selfe to any, but willingly. For if it could be compelled against its Will, it were violent, and not voluntary. But where there is no will, there is no consent. For there is no consent, but voluntary. Therefore where there is consent, there is will: and where there is will, there is freedom: and this is that which I think is called Free-will.

And.

And againe, *Freedom from necessity* (saith he) doth equally belong unto God, and to every reasonable creature, as well bad as good. It is not lost, nor diminished, either by sinne, or misery, it is not greater in the Righteous, then in the Sinner; not more full in an Angell, then in Man. For as the consent of mans will, being by Grace turned unto good, therefore makes a man freely good, and free in that which is good, because he is made voluntary, and not drawn against his will: So being freely devolved into evill, it makes a man nevertheless free, and spontaneous in evill, being led by his own will, and not compelled and enforced by any other to be evill.

Thus we see how Bernard doth agree with Calvin in making the freedom of mans will to consist in a spontaneity, and a freedom from coercion; and in holding that otherwise the will of man (untill it be made free by Grace) is not free to that which is good, but necessitated unto sin, and enslaved by it. The freedom of the will then doth not consist in this, that it is free and indifferent to chuse either good or evil. For so God and the good Angels should not be free, seeing they cannot will any thing but that which is good: neither should the devils, and damned souls be free, seeing they cannot will any thing but that which is evil.

It is not therefore called *Free-will* (saith Bradwardine) because it can freely will, and will any thing whatsoever; but because it can freely will any thing that is its object to be willed, and nill any thing that is its object to be nilled. In vain therefore doth Bellarmine pretend that our Divines make man altogether void of Free-will, for that they hold, that if he have the help of Grace he cannot doe ill; and if he want it, he cannot doe well. But it doth not follow, that therefore they wholly deny Free-will, it being rightly understood. For though man having the help of Grace cannot

Verum libertas à necessitate æquæ & indifferenter Deo universæque tam malæ quam bonæ rationali convenit creaturæ. Nec peccato nec miseriâ amittitur, vel minuitur, nec major in justo est quàm in peccatore, nec plenior in angelo quàm in homin. Quomodo namque ad bonum conversus per gratiam humanæ voluntatis consensus, eò liberè bonum, & in bono liberum hominem facit, quò voluntarius efficitur, non invitus pertrahitur: sic sponte devolutus in malum, in malo nihilominus tam liberum quàm spontaneum constituit suâ uique voluntate ductum, non aliunde coactum ut malus sit. Bern. Ibid.

Non ideo dicitur liberum arbitrium quia liberè potest velle & nolle quodcumque; sed quia liberè potest velle quodcumque objectum suum volubile, & nolle quodcumque objectum suum nolubile. Bradw. de Caus. Dei l. 2. c. 2.

Affirmant præsentæ auxilio gratiæ non posse hominem malè facere, eo verò absente non posse benè facere, ac per hoc nunquam habere liberum voluntatis arbitrium. Bell. de grat. ex lib. arbit. lib. 5. cap. 28.

ing it cannot doe well; yet both, in doing well, by the help of Grace, and in doing ill, for want of it, his will is free, so as that he is not constrained, and forced either the one way or the other: even as both the good Angels and the bad are free in that which they do, though the one cannot do ill, nor the other well. Our Adversaries make the will of man so free, as being incited by Grace, to be able to act, or not to act, as he pleaseth. But how doth this agree with Scripture? *Who maketh thee to differ, and what hast thou, that thou hast not received?* 1 Cor. 4. 7. If a man could of himself, by the power of his free-will, embrace a good motion, and consent unto it, as well as refuse and reject it, then he may make himself to differ from another, and may have something that he hath not received. *No man commeth unto me, except my*

* Magna gratiz commendatio, nemo venit nisi tractus; quem trahat, & quem non trahat, quare illum trahat, & illum non trahat, noli velle judicare, si non vis errare. *Aug. bomil. 26. citat. à Bradw. de Caus. Dei l. 1. c. 35.*

*Father draw him, saith our Saviour, Job. 6. 44. * Here is a great commendation of Grace, (saith Augustine) none comes except he be drawn; whom he drawes, and whom he drawes not, why he drawes this man, and drawes not that, does not judge if thou wouldest not erre.*

The Apostle tells us, That we are not sufficient of our selves to think any thing as of our selves, but all our sufficiency is of God, 2 Cor. 3. 5. By which words of the Apostle

Non equidem quodd vel ipse consensus, in quo omne meritum consistit, ab ipso fit, cum nec cogitare (quod minus est quam consentire) aliquid à nobis quasi ex nobis sufficientes sumus. *Bern. de grat. & lib. arbit.*

Sunt qui dicunt Deum semper prævenire pulsando, & excitando, &c. & hominem subsequi apertiendo, & consentiendo, idque ex propriis viribus, &c.

—Minus est cogitare, quam credere. *Bradward. de Caus. lib. 1. cap. 38.*

Hæc positio tribuit nobis quod melius est, & majus; Deo verò quod deterius, & minus. Quis enim dubitaret aperire melius, & utilius nobis esse, sed oblit. *Bradward. Ibid.*

Bernard proves that it is not in the power of mans free will without the Grace of God to consent unto a good motion, seeing he cannot of himself so much as think a good thought, which yet is lesse then to consent unto it. So by the same words Bradwardine confutes those who hold, that if God prevent a man by knocking and inciting, then man of himself doth follow, by opening and consenting. But (saith he, having cited the words of the Apostle) it is lesse to think, then to believe. And he doth well observe, That this doctrine ascribes that which is the better, and the greater unto man, and that which is

quàm pulsare? cum pulsare sine apertione non profit,

the worse and the lesse unto God. For that without doubt it is better and more for our profit to open, then to knock, seeing that knocking without opening avayles nothing, but is rather hurtfull. And citing a saying of * S. Austine. viz. Wee live more safe if wee give all to God, and doe not commit our selves in part to him; and in part to our selves; hee adds, Therefore to him doe I wholly commit my selfe with my whole devotion, and to his most acceptable grace doe I wholly submit my selfe. Surely David; when hee

prayed, *Vnite my heart to feare thy Name, Psal. 85. 11.* was farre from meaning thus, that God should so move him to obedience as that hee might either obey, or not obey, as hee pleased. So when hee prayed, *Let mee not wander from thy Commandements. Psal. 119. 10.* And, *make mee to goe in the path of thy Commandements. v. 35.* were it not most absurd to understand it thus, *Let me not wander, except I will; and make mee to goe, if I will?* So when God promiseth, *I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walke in my statutes, &c. Ezek. 36. 27.* And, *I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from mee. Jer. 32. 40.* it were most ridiculous to interpret it thus, *I will cause you to walke in my statutes, if you will; and that you shall not depart from me, except you will.*

God promiseth *Ezek. 36. 26.* to take away the stony heart, that is, the contumacy, stubbornesse and disobedience of the heart; and to give a heart of flesh, that is, to make the heart soft, pliable and obedient. By this and other places of Scripture Bradwardine confutes those, who say, that God by his Grace will convert a man, if he doe not put a barre in the way. * *Whatsoever* (saith hee) *this barre is said to be, none can take it away, but God; and if hee will take it away, it is irresistibly taken away. Whence the Lord himselfe saith, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy. Exodus 33.* And againe, *I will take away the stony Heart. Ezek. 36.* So the Apostle, *He hath mercy on whom hee will have mercy, &c. Rom. 9.* After these Scriptures hee brings in that of

* *Aug. de bono perseverantia cap. 9.* *Tutiores vivimus, si totum Deo damus, non nos illi ex parte, & nobis ex parte committimus. Ipsi ergo me totum tota devotione committo, ac ejus gratissima gratiae totaliter me submitto. Bradw. Ibid.*

So when the Church prayeth *Lam. 5. 21.* *Tu tu thou us unto thee O Lord, and wee shall be turned, were it not ridiculous to expound it, wee shall be turned, if we will?*

* *Quicquid obex dicitur; nullus potest hunc obicem tollere nisi Deus: & si ipse eum voluerit tollere, irresistibiliter tollitur. Unde & ipsemet Dominus, Miserebor cui voluero, &c. Exod. 33.* Et iterum, *Auferam cor lapideum, &c. Exod. 36.* Et Apostolus, *Cujus vult, miseretur, &c. Rom. 9.* Bradw. de caus Dei lib. 2. cap. 32.

Austine

Et Aug. de Prædest. 88 c. 9. Hæc grãtia, quæ occultè humanis cordibus divinã largitate tribuitur, à nullo duro corde respuitur: ideo quippe tribuitur, ut cordis duritia primitus auferatur. *Bradw. Ibid.*

Aufine, worthy to be written in Letters of gold, *This grace* (saith hee) *which by the bounty of God is secretly infused into the hearts of men, is refused by no hard heart. For therefore it is infused that in the first place the hardness of the heart may be taken away.* It

only adde one Scripture more, with *Aufines* glosse upon it, to shew that man being stirred up by preventing grace, hath not by his own Free will power to consent unto, and to doe that which is good, but it is God, who by his grace doth worke this in him. So the Apostle plainly tells us. *It is God,* (saith hee) *that worketh in you, both to Will and to do of his good pleasure.* Phil. 2.

† Nos ergo volumus, sed Deus in nobis operatur & velle: nos ergo operamur, sed Deus in nobis operatur & operari pro bonâ voluntate. Hoc nobis expedit & credere, & dicere: hoc est piûm, hoc verum, ut sit humilis & submissa confessio, & totius Deo detur. *Aug. de bono persever. cap. 13.*

13. Therefore (saith † *Aufine*) we Will, but God doth worke this will in us: therefore wee Worke, but God doth worke this worke in us of his good pleasure. *This is expedient for us both to believe, and to speake: this is pious, this is true; that so confession may be humble, and submisse, and that all may be ascribed unto God.* And thus I hope it may

sufficiently appeare, that we have no cause to decline either the authority of the Scriptures, or the testimonies of Fathers, in this point concerning *Free-will*.

I come now to those Scriptures, and Fathers, which the Mar-quesse doth alledge against us. Three places of Scripture are cited for prooffe of *Free-will*, such as our Adversaries maintaine, and wee impugne. First, that 1 Cor. 7. 37. (it is misprinted, 1 Cor. 17.) *Hee that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart, that hee will keepe his virgin, doth well.* But what is there here to proove *Free-will*? Perhaps those words, *hath power over his own will.* But the Apostle there speakes of a man, that hath a daughter marriageable, yet determines to keepe her unmarried: which the Apostle approves, so that the man have no necessity, that is, no necessary cause of giving his daughter in marriage, but *hath power over his owne will*, that is, hath power to effect and accomplish that which hee willeth, so as no inconvenience to ensue upon it. After this manner doth

* *Cajetan* himselfe in his *Commentaries* upon the place expound these wordes but hath power over his own will, viz. to accomplish it, in that the *Virgin* doth consent to abstaine from marriage. For if she should dissent, then the Father should not have power of accomplishing his own will. Thus *Cajetan*; now what is this to the controversie about free will? though (I know) *Bellarmino* also brings it in, as also another place as little to the purpose, namely that, *2 Cor. 9. 7.* Every man according as hee purposeth in his heart, so let him give, not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a chearfull giver. Men must give almes willingly and chearfully, therefore men have free will. It doth not follow; no more then that because men must serve God with a perfect heart, and with a willing minde, *1 Chron. 28. 9.* therefore of themselves by the power of Free-will they are able to do it. The *Rhemists* tacitely confesse these places to be impertinent to the point in hand, passing them over in their Annotations, and making no use of them, as they are ready enough to doe, when they meet with any thing, which they thinke doth make for them. The next place is *Deut. 30. 19.* (not as it is printed 11.) *I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; chuse life, that thou and thy seed may live.* This place *Bellarmino* presumes much upon, saying that hee sees not what can bee answered to it. And so the English Papists, who translated the old Testament at *Doway*, in their notes upon the place say, what Doctor can more plainly teach Free-will in man, then this Text of holy Scripture? But what is the reason of all this confidence? because man is bidden to chuse life, doth it therefore follow, that of himselfe hee is free and able to doe it? why? So man is bidden to worke out his own salvation, *Phil. 2. 12.* yet (as the Apostle addes immediately *v. 13.*) it is God that doth worke in him both the Will and the Deed. Man is bidden to come unto Christ, *Isai. 53. 3.* yet can hee not come, except the Father draw him. *Joh. 6. 44.* Man is bidden to arise from the dead, *Ephes. 5. 14.* Can he therefore being dead quicken himself? Surely the same Apostle tells us in the same Epistle, that it is God that doth quicken those that are dead in trespasses and sinnes. *Ephes. 2. 5.* There is no more force in that place of *Deuteronomie*,

* *Potestatem habens voluntatis suae perficiendae, b. e. quod virgo consentiat abstinenciae à conjugio. Si enim virgo dissentiret, non haberet patet potestatem voluntatis propriae perficiendae. Cajetan; ad loc.*

Bell de grat. & lib. arb. l. 5. c. 23.

Non video quid ad hunc locum responderi possit. Bell. de grat. et lib. arb. lib. 5. ca. 23.

*Beil. de gra. &
lib. arbi. lib. 5.
cap. 12. & lib.
6. cap. 10.*

Magnum aliquid *Pelagiani* se scire putant, quando dicunt, non juberet Deus, quod sciret non posse ab homine fieri. Quis hoc nesciat? Sed ided juber aliqui, quz non possumus, ut noverimus quid ab illo petere debeamus. *Aug. de grat. & lib. arb. cap. 16.*

Da Domine
quod jubes, &
jube quod vis.

Quis nesciat secundum omnia jura, Divina pariter & humana, impotentiam descendentem ex culpa nullatenus excusare, sed forsitan potius aggravare, &c. *Bradw. de Causi. Dei lib. 1. cap. 43.*

for prooffe of *Free-will*, then in any other place of Scripture, which containeth in it precept, or exhortation. And indeed our adversaries doe pretend, that all such places are for them. And so did the *Pelagians* of old object such places: but *Austine* answers them, that though it's true, God doth not command man to

doe that which cannot bee done by him, yet hee commandeth us to doe what wee are not able to doe (viz. of our selves,) that wee may seeke unto him to make us able. Thus the people of God do; *Turne unto me*, saith God, *Joel 2. 12. Turne thou us unto thee*, say the people of God, *Lam. 5. 21.* And by comparing places of Scripture together we may finde, that what God doth require of his people, the same hee doth promise unto them. *Wash thee, make thee cleane*, saith he, *Isai. 1. 16.* But *Ezek. 36. 25. I will sprinkle cleane water upon you (saith hee) and you shall be cleane*, So *Ezek. 18. 31. God commands saying. c. Make you a new heart, and a new spirit.* But *Ezek. 36. 26. hee promisseth this very thing. c. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit. will I put within you.* And accordingly *David* prayed unto God to worke this in him, *Create in me a cleane heart O Lord, and renew a right spirit within me. Psal. 51. 10.* And that of *Austine* is well known, *Give O Lord what thou dost command, and then command what thou wilt.* Besides, as *Bradwardine* observed long agoe, impotency and inability to performe a duty, proceeding from a mans own fault, doth nothing excuse him either by the Law of God, or man. A bankrupt may justly be required to pay his debt, though hee be not able to pay it. Againe, Gods Precepts and Exhortations are not in vaine, though man by the power of his own *Free-will* be not able to doe what is required; because God doth make those very Precepts and Exhortations meanes whereby to worke that in his elect, which hee doth require of them. When *Christ* spake to *Lazarus* being dead and buried, saying, *Lazarus come forth*, *Job. 1. 1.* this was not in vaine, though its certaine, a man that's dead, and laid in the grave, hath no power of himselfe to come forth; yet (I say) it was not in vaine, that *Christ* spake

so unto *Lazarus*; for together with his word hee sent forth his Divine power, and so enabled *Lazarus* to come forth, as hee required. So neither is it in vaine, that God doth command men to doe things, which of themselves they cannot doe, because he accompanying his word with his spirit, enables them to do what hee commands. *Verily, verily, I say unto you* (saith Christ) *the houre is coming, and now is, when the dead shall heare the voyce of the Son of God; and they that heare, shall live.* Joh. 5. 25. Our Saviour there speakes of such as are spiritually dead, as appears those words and now is, and he shewes, that his word is a powerfull and effectuall meanes (*viz.* by the concurrence of his spirit) to work the life of grace in them.

The third and last place of Scripture, which the Marquesse citeth for *Free-will*, is that *Mat. 23. 37. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a Hen gathereth her Chickens under her Wings, and yee would not.* But what doth this place prove? That men have *Free-will* so farre forth, as of themselves to resist and reject the offers of grace; which wee nothing doubt of. But the question is, whether men have such a *Free-will*, as that of themselves they can receive grace when it is offered. This is that which wee deny, neither doth the place alledged, make any thing for proove of it.

The Marquesse saith, *There might have been a willingnesse, as well as an unwillingnesse,* (so it should be, though it be printed, as well as a willing) or else Christ had wept in vaine: and to thinke that he did so, were to make him an impostor. I grant that there might have been a willingnesse, but not by the power of *Free-will*, except made free by grace, it being God that doth worke both the will and the deed. *Phil. 2. 13.* So the Jewes, of whom Christ complained, that they would not come unto him, *Joh. 5. 40.* might have come; but yet of themselves they could not come, nor except it were given unto them of God, *Joh. 6. 65.* nor except hee did draw them. *Joh. 6. 44.* Whereas the Marquesse speakes of Christs weeping, his minde was (it seemes) upon another place, *viz.* that *Luk. 19. 41, 42.* where it is said, that Christ drawing nigh to *Jerusalem*, beheld it, and wept over it, saying, *If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace: but now they are hid from thine eyes.*

But that Christ wept, when he said, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children, &c.* this we do not find, though the words be recorded both *Mat. 27. 37.* and also *Luke 13. 34.*

But suppose that Christ had wept, when he said, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, &c.* yet had not his weeping been in vaine, though *Jerusalem* had no power of her selfe to doe that which there Christ speaks of. For yet neverthelesse Christ shewed his affection towards *Jerusalem*, even as he did towards *Lazarus*, when he wept over him as he lay over the grave. Behold how he loved him, said the Jewes, *John 11. 36.* yet it is without all question, that *Lazarus* of himself could not have come out of the grave, except Christ by his Almighty power had raised him up. Some perhaps may say, But why did Christ complain of *Jerusalem* for her unwillingnesse, if it were not in her power to be willing? I answer, because both her unwillingnesse, and also her want of power to be willing was from her self; it was her own fault, and therefore she was justly complained of, and reproved for it.

But againe, some may say, *Jerusalem* had sufficient grace whereby she might have been willing, or else Christ would not have complained that she was unwilling. I answer, *Jerusalem* had a sufficiency of the means of Grace, which she ought to have made use of, and to have been wrought upon by, but would not, and therefore did Christ complain of her. But *Jerusalem* had not a sufficiency of the Spirit of Grace, without which she could not improve the means, as she should have done; and yet neverthelesse, the complaint made of her was just: For God having given unto man, at first, Grace sufficient to doe whatsoever he should require, and this Grace being lost by mans own fault, *Eccles. 7. 29.* God is not bound to restore it but when, and where he pleaseth; and yet may justly require the obedience that is due unto him, and complain for want of it, as a man may justly demand his debt of a bankrupt, and complain of him for not paying it, though he be not able to pay it. **Raimundus de Sabunde*, a Ropish

* Homo non potest solvere, nec reddere Deo, quod debet Deo: quia non potest Deo reddere totum agnorem suum,

nec timorem, nec honorem, nec obedientiam, nec voluntatem Dei facere, quia corruptus est, & mutatus in contrarium suae naturae; & ipsemet fecit se talem, ut non possit Deo facere quod debet: & tamen semper debet: & si debitum semper manet, nec excusatur, quia tenetur: & si non potest, ipsemet est in culpa, & in culpa quare non potest. *Raimund. de Sabunda. Theolog. Natur. lib. 250.*

Author,

Author, is large in his expressions to this purpose, *That man being now corrupt, and made quite contrary to what he was at first, cannot pay that which he oweth unto God; cannot love, fear, honour, and obey God as he ought: and that yet neverthelesse the debt still remaines, this is still due unto God, and man is not excus'd, because though he be not able, yet he himselfe is the cause of his inability, and it is his owne fault that he is not able.*

After the allegation of these places of Scriptures, the Marquesse adds, that the Ancient Fathers are of their Opinion, viz. in point of Free-will, and he cites *Euseb. Cesar. de prep. l. 1. c. 7. Hil. de Trinit. Aug. l. 1. ad Simpl. q. 4. Ambr. in Luk. 12. Chrys. hom. 19. in Gen. Irenaus, l. 4. c. 72. Cyrill. in Joh. l. 4. c. 7.*

Now for diverse of the Antient Fathers, and namely for *Ausfine*, (whom the Marquesse alledgeth against us, and who indeed is chiefly to be looked at in this Controversie, as having most occasion to declare himself in it, by reason of the Pelagian Heresie which arose in his time) I have sufficiently shewed before how far they are from compliance with our Adversaries.

But to come to a particular examination of the Authors and places that are cited. First *Eusebius*, in the place mentioned, hath nothing at all (that I can find) about Free-will, the whole Chapter being *de Phœnicum Theologiâ*, about the Divinity of the *Phœnicians*.

Hilary is so cited, that there is no looking after him; for he wrote twelve books of the Trinity, and here he is onely cited, *de Trin. 1.* of the Trinity, but in which of the twelve Books he saith any thing to this purpose, is not mentioned.

As for *Ausfine*, that which the Marquesse (I presume) intended, is, *lib. 1. ad Simplic. quest. 2.* not *q. 4.* for there are but two Questions answered in the first Book; in the second Book indeed there are more then four Questions, but nothing about Free-will. In the first Book, and second Question, there is something that may seeme to make for the Opinion of the Marquesse, but much more is there, which doth indeed make against it; indeed, so much, that though *Bellarmine* cite diverse passages out of *Ausfine* for proof of Free-will, yet he was more cautious (it seemes) then to cite any thing out of that which *Ausfine* wrote about it to *Simplicianus*.

Let us hear what *Austine* himself, in his *Retractions* (where in he did review all his Works) saith concerning his books written to *Simplicianus*, and concerning that very Question; in

In cujus questionis solutione laboratum est quidem pro libero arbitrio voluntatis humanæ, sed vicit Dei gratia.
Aug. Retract. lib. 2. cap. 1.

answer whereunto he hath much about Free-will: *In the solution of which question* (saith he) *mans Free-will was much laboured for but the Grace of God did overcome.* And this will clearly appear by perusing the Book it selfe, and the question handled in it. The question is about the meaning of those words, *Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated,* and the rest that follow, *Rom. 9.*

Noluit ergo Esau, & non cucurrit, sed & si voluisset, & cucurrisset, Dei adjutorio pervenisset, qui ei etiam velle, & currere præstaret, nisi vocatione contempta reprobus fieret. Aliiter enim Deus præstat ut velimus, aliter quod voluerimus. Ut velimus enim, & suum esse voluit, & nostrum; suum vocando, nostrum sequendo. Quod autem voluerimus, solus præstat, id est, posse bene agere, & semper beate vivere.
Aug. ad Simplic. lib. 1. quest. 2.

Now among other things that *Austine* saith, there is this, which (as I conceive) the Mar-quesse aimed at, *Esau was not willing, and did not run; but if he had been willing, and had run, by the help of God he had obtained; God would have given him both to will, and to run, except by condemning Gods Call he would be a Reprobate. For God doth otherwise give us, that we may will, then he doth give us that which we have willed. For that we may will, God would have both to be his work, and ours;*

his by Calling, ours by Following when we are called. But that which we have willed, God alone doth give, that is, to be able to do well, and for ever to live happily.

Here, I confesse, *Austine* doth seeme to shew himself a patron of Free-will, and we could not easily judge otherwise of him, if we should look meerly upon these words, and take them as his positive sentence. But if we consider what *Austine* saith both before, and after, we shall see that he spake thus rather by way of objection, then by way of determination. Before these words

Non ideo bene currit rota ut rotunda sit, sed quia rotunda est: sic nemo propterea bene operatur, ut accipiat gratiam, sed quia accepit. *Aug. Ibid.*

he saith thus, *A wheel doth not therefore run well, that it may be round, but because it is round. So no man doth therefore Work well, that he may receive grace, but because he hath received it. Austine* therefore was not of that minde, that *Esau* of himself, by his free-will, could have been willing, and have run; or that any, when he is called, and incited by Grace, can by

by the power of Free-will follow, and obey, but it is grace that must work this in him.

To this purpose againe before the words objected, *If (saith Austine) Jacob did therefore believe, because he would, then God did not bestow faith on him, but he by willing did afford it unto himself, and so he had something which he received not.* Which is contrary to the words of the Apostle, *What hast thou, that thou hast not received?* 1 Cor. 4. 7. But a little after those words that seeme to make for Free-will, *Austine* expresseth himself more fully: For having cited that of the Apostle, *Phil. 2. 12, 13. Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you, both to will, and to doe of his good pleasure,* he addes, *The Apostle there sufficiently shewes, that a good will it self is wrought in us by God. For if therefore only it be said, (Rom. 9.) It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy, because the will of man alone is not sufficient, that he may justly, and rightly, except it be helped by the mercy of God; then by this reason it may be said, It is not of God that sheweth mercy, but of man that willeth, because the mercy of God alone is not sufficient, unlesse the consent of our will be added. But that is manifest, that we will in vain, except God shew mercy. This I know not how it can be said, that God doth shew mercy in vain, except we be willing. For if God shew mercy, then we are willing; seeing it belongs to that same mercy to make us willing. For it is God that worketh in us both to will, and to doe of his good pleasure.*

Again a little after, having said by way of objection, *Free-will availeth much; he answers, Nay, it is indeed, but in those, that are sold under sinne* (as all are till they be freed by Grace) *What doth it avail?*

Si ergo Jacob ideo credidit, quia voluit, non ei Deus donavit fidem, sed eam sibi ipse volendo præstitit, & habuit aliquid, quod non accepit. Aug. Ibid.

Ubi satis ostendit etiam ipsam bonam voluntatem in nobis operante Deo fieri. Nam si propterea solum dictum est, Non volentis, neque currentis, sed miserentis est Dei, quia voluntas hominis sola non sufficit, ut iuste recteq; vivatur, nisi adjuvetur misericordia Dei; potest & hoc modo dici, Igitur non miserentis est Dei, sed volentis est hominis, quia misericordia Dei sola non sufficit, nisi consensus nostræ voluntatis addatur. At illud manifestum est, frustrà nos velle, nisi Deus misereatur. Illud nescio quomodo dicatur, frustrà Deum misereri, nisi nos velimus. Si enim Deus misereatur, etiam volumus: ad eandem quippe misericordiam pertinet, ut velimus. Deus enim est, qui operatur in nobis & velle, & operari pro bonâ voluntate. Aug. Ibid.

Liberum voluntatis arbitrium plurimum valet: imò verò, est quidem, sed in veauandis sub peccato quid valet? Aug. Ibid.

Cum ergo nos ea delectant, quibus proficiamus ad Deum, inspiratur hoc, & præbatur gratia Dei, non nutu nostro, & industria, aut operum meritis comparatur; quia ut sit nutus voluntatis, ut sit industria studii, ut sint opera charitate ferventia, ille tribuit, ille largitur. *Aug. Ibid.*

pointed at by the Marquesse, *Austine* was most farre from maintaining such a *Free-will*, as we oppose. There is also a passage in

Quamvis sit in cuiusque potestate quid velit, non est tamen in cuiusquam potestate quid possit. *Aug. lib. 2 ad Simpli. quest. 1.*

Quod ideo dictum est, quia non dicimus esse in potestate nostra, nisi quod cum volumus, sit, ubi prius, & maxime est ipsum velle. Sine ullo quippe intervallo temporis præsto est voluntas ipsa cum volumus: sed hanc quoque ad bene vivendum desuper accipimus potestatem, cum præparatur voluntas à Domino. *Aug. Retract. lib. 2. cap. 1.*

Lord. Thus carefull was that good Father to prevent the mistaking of his words, lest any should thinke that hee did ascribe any thing to the power of *Free-will*, in that which is good.

So much for *Austine*; the next Father alledged is *Ambrose*, who in the place cited, viz. in *Luk. 12.* hath nothing above *Free-will*, that I can finde. After him followes *Chrysostome*, who indeed in the place, that is alledged, goes far

Quia ergo liberi arbitrii esse nostram naturam fecit omnium Dominus, ipse quidem, quæ sua sunt, omnia pro sua misericordia semper exhibet. — Et necessitatem utique non imponit, sed congruis remediis appositis totum jacere in ægrotantis sententiâ dimittit. *Chrysost. Hom. 19. in Gen.*

And againe, When those things delight us, whereby wee profit towards God, this is inspired, and given unto us by the grace of God, it is not gotten by our consent, industry, or the merits of our workes: because the consent of the will, the industry of endeavour, and workes fervent with charity, are all the gift of God. Thus then it is most manifest, that in the place

Austines *second book to *Simplicianus*, quest. 1. which may seeme to make against us, viz. That to will any thing, is in the power of every one, but to be able to doe any thing, is not in the power of any. But let *Austine* explain himself, and shew his own meaning; and that he doth in his *Retractions*; That (saith hee) was spoken, because we do not say, that any thing is in our power, but that which is done when we will. Where first, and chieftly is to will it selfe. For immediately without any distance of time the Will it selfe is present, when we will. But this power also to live well, wee receive from above, when the will is prepared of the

indeed in the place, that is alledged, goes far in his expressions concerning *Free-will*, as if God onely did afford meanes, and so leave it in the power of man to use them, or not, as hee pleaseth.

If therefore I except against his testimony in this point, I have no meane men of the Church of *Rome* to beare mee out.

I know * *Bellarmine* seems to take it as a matter of great advantage, that *Calvin* stands not here so much upon *Chrysostome*, as one that did too much extoll the power of Free-will. But was this onely *Calvin's* judgement of *Chrysostome*? Did not some of the Romanists themselves also think thus of him? † *S. Chrysostom* (saith *Alvarez* a Romish Archbishop, and a great Schooleman) sometimes doth wonderfully extoll the power of our Free-will, speaking as it were hyperbolically, whiles hee strives to impugn the errors of the *Manichees*, and of the *Gentiles*, who held that Man is still by nature (as hee was first created of God) or that by the violence of fate he is compelled to sinne. So also *Janenius* (a Romish Bishop, to whom also *Alvarez* doth referre us) having mentioned something of *Euthymius*, and *Theophylact*, hee saith, that those passages were taken from *Chrysostome*, and that except they be warily read, and understood, they may give occasion of falling into the error of *Pelagius*, who held, that the beginning of faith, and justification is from our selves, and the consummation from God, &c. *Chrysostome* (he saith) meant well concerning the grace of God, yet he wrote many things against the *Manichees* in commendation of Free-will, attributing most things unto it without making any mention of Gods Grace; which things he would not have written in that manner, if hee could have foreseen that *Pelagius* his heresse would arise, which as then was not risen, or not known unto men. Thus wee see how these Authors, though they excuse *Chrysostomes* meaning, yet dislike his expression. But some amongst those of the Roman Church have gone further in their censure of *Chrysostome*, as * *Alvarez*

non valeret, quamam ratione libertas arbitrii nostri salva posset consistere, si Deus sua gratia nostram praeveniret electionem, credidisse, electionem, quā primo acceptamus bona, eaque facere decernimus, esse priorem ipsā Dei gratiā, postea vero subsequi gratiam, quā adjuvamur, & nobis cooperatur Deus. *Alvar. loc. citat.*

* Hunc patrem nobis *Calvinus* libenter concedit, quod ei initius visus sit in liberi arbitrii viribus praedicandis. At imperitiam suam opere prodit, &c. *Bel. de grat. lib. arb. l. 5. c. 25.*

† *S. Chrysostomus* nonnunquam vices nostri liberi arbitrii mirum in modum extollit, loquendo quasi per hyperboleam ex contumacia impugnandi Manicheorum, & gentilium errores &c. *Alvar. de auxil. diff. 22. Sect. 33.*

Quae dicta à *Chrysostomi* locutione in variis locis ferè desumpta, nisi cautè legantur, & intelligantur, praeberè possunt occasionem erroris *Pelagii*, qui asseruit initium fidei, & justificationis esse ex nobis, consummationem verò ex Deo, &c. *Chrysostomus* sanè optimè sentiens de Dei gratiā, &c. tamen multa scripsit contra *Manichaeum* in commendationem liberi arbitrii, pleraque illi tribuens sine commemoratione gratiae Divinae, quae non sic scripsisset, si praevidere potuisset exituram *Pelagii* haeresein, quae tum adhuc non erat exorta, vel illi cognita. *Janfen. Concord. ap. 59.*

* Quidam respondent, &c. *Chrysostomum*, cum intelligere

relates, viz. that he held, that election, whereby we first accept those things, that are good, and resolve to doe them, is before the grace of God, and that then grace doth follow after, whereby we are helped, and God doth co-operate with us. To this purpose I finde *Tolet*, a Jesuite first, and afterwards a Cardinall, cited by *Chamier*, though I have not his Booke now at hand to peruse. And this may suffice for answer to *Chrysostome*, yea and to those other two Fathers also, that follow, viz. *Irenaeus* and

Cyrril, the latter of these being by name, and both of them implicitly excepted against by some of the Romanists themselves, as appeares by what is cited in the margent, as also by the reasons alledged by *Alvarez*, and *Iansenius*, why *Chrysostome* did exceede at least in his expressions, viz. because he was so earnest against the Manichees and others, and knew nothing of the contrary error of the *Pelagians*, which reasons might transport the other Fathers also. It is true (saith *Alvarez*) that *S. Chrysostome*, and other Fathers, that wrote before the Heresie of Pelagius was risen up, did speake little of the grace of Christ, and much for the confirming of the liberty of the Will against the heresie of the Manichees. He addes that *Austine* also in his writings against the *Pelagians* did observe this, and hee cites his

words to this purpose. Yea, hee shewes that *Austine* in his *Re-tractions* was faine to answer in like manner for himself, when as the *Pelagians* did make use of his former writings against the Manichees, thereby to maintaine their opinion concerning the power of *Free-will* in opposition to the necessity and efficacy of Gods Grace.

Thus likewise *Iansenius* saith, that after the Pelagian heresie was risen, then *Austine* spake more exactly, and more expressly of the Grace of God. The Jesuit

Toletus in *Ioh. 6.* agnoscit *Chrysostomi* hanc esse sententiam, hominem per liberum arbitrium seipsum facere dignum gratiâ, eandem esse *Cyrrilli*, aliorum etiam doctorum, maxime *Græcorum*. *Cham. tom. 3. l. 3. c. 16. Sect. 11.*

Verum est, quod *S. Chrysostomus*, & alii Patres qui ante exortam hæresin *Pelagii* scripserunt, pauca de gratiâ Christi, & plurima pro confirmandâ arbitrii libertate contra hæresin Manicheorum docuerunt, quod & *S. Augustinus* advertit, &c. *Alvar. disp. 22. Sect. 22.*

Itaque *Augustinus* exortâ jam hæresin *Pelagianâ*, exactius & expressius locutus est de Dei gratiâ, &c. *Iansen. contend. cap. 59.*

* *Ammonius*,

Cyrrillus, *Theophylactus*, & *Euthymius*, respondent non omnes trahi, quia non omnes digni sunt. Quod nimis affine est *Pelagianorum* errori. Quasi verò homo antequam per gratiam ad gratiam trahatur, mereri possit gratiâ, quod est dignum fieri, qui trahatur. *Malden. in Ioh. 6. 44.*

and

and *Euthymius* so expound that, *No man cometh unto me except the Father draw him*, that they come too nigh the error of *Pelagius*, viz. that all are not drawn, because all are not worthy, as if (saith he) before a man be drawn by grace unto grace, hee could deserve grace, which is to be worthy to be drawn.

But though *Irenaus*, and *Cyrill* be liable to these exceptions, yet I see nothing in the places cited by the *Marquesse*, wherein they make against us. *Irenaus* saith thus, *If it were not in us to doe these things, or not to do them*, Why did the *Apostle*, and before him the *Lord* himself counsell us to doe some things, and to abstaine from other things? Here *Irenaus* indeed sheweth that it is in us to doe, or not to doe, but hee doth not say that it is in nobis ex nobis, in us of our selves, by the power of our *Free-will* to doe things truly good. He addes immediately, that man from the beginning is free, as *God*, after whose likenesse hee was made, is free. Now this doth rather make against our adversaries then for them; for it shewes, that the freedome of mans will doth not consist in this, that hee is free either to doe good, or to doe evill; seeing that *God* is not free in that manner, hee being onely free to doe good, but altogether incapable of doing evill. So man being determined by grace to that, which is good, yet is free, because not constrained nor forced against his will, in the doing of it: and so on the other side hee is free in doing evill, though of himselfe without grace he can doe nothing but evill. As for the other Fathers, viz. *Cyrill*, that which hee saith in the place alledged, is this, *Wee cannot according to the doctrine of the Church, and of the truth, by any meanes deny the free power of man, which is called Free-will*. This is nothing against us, who doe not (as hath bene shewed before) simply deny *Free-will*, but onely so as our adversaries of the Church of *Rome* doe maintaine it. To that which is in controversie betwixt us, and our adversaries, *Cyrill* here saith nothing, and therefore his

Si igitur non in nobis esset facere hæc, aut non facere, quam causam habebat *Apostolus*, & multo prius ipse *Dominus* consilium dare, quædam quidem facere, à quibuscumque verò abstinere? *Iren. lib. 4. cap. 72.*

Sed quoniam liberæ sententiæ ab initio est homo, & liberæ sententiæ est *Deus*, ad cuius similitudinem factus est, semper consilium datur ei continere bonum, &c. *Ibid.*

Non possumus secundum *Ecclesiæ* veritatisque dogmata, liberam potestatem hominis, quod liberum arbitrium appellatur, ullo modo negare. *Cyr. in Job. l. 4. c. 7.*

testimony is not to the purpose. And so much for *Free-will*.

In the next place, *We hold it possible* (saith the Marquesse) *to keep the Commandements*; you say it is impossible. *Wee have Scripture for it.* Luke 1.6. *And they were both brightsons before God, walking in all the Commandements, and Ordinances of the Lord, blamelesse.* And 1 Joh. 5. 3. *His Commandements are not grievous.*

For keeping the Commandements we hold, not that it is simply impossible, but that according to that measure of grace, which God doth ordinarily bestow upon men here in this life, it is not possible to keep them, *viz.* so as not to be guilty of the breach of them. If a man could fully and perfectly keep the Commandements, then he should be without sin; for sinne is nothing else but a transgression of the Law, as Saint John defines it, 1 Joh. 3. 4. But the Scripture shewes that no man in this life is so perfect as to be without sinne. *There is not a just man upon earth that doth good, and sinneth not,* saith Salomon, Eccles. 7. 20. *If we say that we have no sinne, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us,* saith Saint John, 1 Joh. 1. 8. *In many things we offend all,* saith Saint James, Jam. 3. 2. And Christ hath taught all to pray for forgiveness of sinnes, Mat. 6. 12. which supposeth that all, even the best that live upon earth, have need of it, that they are guilty of sinnes, and so consequently come short of the full,

Solida responsio est; peccata venialia, sine quibus non vivimus, non esse peccata simpliciter, sed imperfectè, & secundum quid, neque esse contra legem, sed præter legem, &c. Bell. de Justif. lib. 4. cap. 14.

and perfect keeping of Gods Commandements. Bellarmine thinks to elude these places, by saying, *That we cannot indeed live without Veniall sinnes, but that Veniall sinnes are not sinnes simply, but only imperfectly, and in some respect; and that they are not against the Law, but only besides it.*

But first, Veniall sinnes are against the Law, as being transgressions of it; for else they are no sinnes at all, that being the very nature of sinne, to be a transgression of the Law, 1 Joh. 3. 4.

2. There are no sins so veniall, but that without the mercy of God in Christ they are damnable. It being written, *Cursed is everyone that committeth not in all things, that are written in the book of the Law to doe them,* Gal. 3. 10.

And thirdly, no man living upon earth is free from such sinnes,

as that he is able to stand, if God shall enter into judgement with him. If thou Lord shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord who shall stand? Psal. 130. 3. Enter not into judgement With thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified, Psal. 143. 2.

The Fathers here are on our side; Hierome having cited that of our Saviour, Out of the hearts of men proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, &c. addes, Let him come forth, that can testifie that these things are not in his heart, and I will confesse that full and perfect righteousness may be in this mortall body. Who is there (saith Leo) so free from fault, that there is not in him that, which either justice may condemn, or mercy may pardon? In no thing to sinne, is proper unto God, saith Ambrose. He means that no man in this life can attain unto that perfection; for so he addes presently after, He that bears about him flesh (a mortall body) is subject unto sinne.

Thus also Augustine, Who is there. (saith he) in this life so clean, but that he hath need to be made yet more and more clean? And again, The Church (saith he) in this life is so cleansed, not that they that are justified have no mainders of sinne in them, but that they have not any spot of criminall offence, nor any wrinkle of falsehood. Accordingly speaks Gregory, In this life (saith hee) many are without criminall offences, but none can bee without sinne. And presently after hee sayes, that these finnes, which none can be without, doe pollute the soule, though they doe not destroy it. Bernard interprets that of Saint John, He that is born of God sinneth not, 1 John 3. 9. thus, He sinneth not, that is, he doth not continue in sinne. Or thus, He sinneth not, that is, it is as much as if he did not sinne, because sinne is not imputed unto

Procedat, qui in corde suo hæc non esse testetur, & plenam in corpore isto mortali iustitiam confitebor. Hier. dial. advers. Pelag. l. 2.

Quis invenitur ita immunis à culpâ, ut in eo non habeat vel iustitia quod arguat, vel misericordia quod remittat? Leo Ser. 7. de solen. Epiphan. Nihil peccare, solius est Dei. — Qui carnem gerit, culpæ obnoxius est. Ambros. lib. 1. Epist. 3.

Quis est in hac vitâ sic mundus, ut non sit magis magisque mundandus? Aug. tract. 80. in Iob.

Sic mundatur Ecclesia in hac vitâ, non ut iustificati nullas in se habeant peccati reliquias, sed ut maculam criminis, & rugam non habeant salutaris. Aug. contra Iul. l. 4. c. 3.

In hac vitâ multi sine crimine, nullus verò esse sine peccato valet. — Nonnulla peccata animam pollunt, quam crimina exungunt. Greg. in Iob. lib. 2. 1. cap. 10.

Non peccat, id est, non permanet in peccato. — Sive non peccat, id est, tanrudem est, ac si non peccet, pro eo scilicet quod non imputatur ei peccatum. Bern. in Septuag. f. Ser. 1.

Nec latuit præceptorem, præcepti pondus hominum excedere vires, sed iudicavit utile ex hoc ipso suæ illos insufficientiæ admoneri, & ut scirent sanè ad quem iustitiæ finem niti pro viribus oporteret. Ergo mandando impossibilia non prævaricatores homines fecit, sed humiles, ut omne os obstruatur, & subditus fiat omnis mundus Deo, quia ex operibus legis non iustificabitur omnis caro coram illo. Accipientes quippe mandatum, & sentientes defectum clamabimus in cælum, & miserebitur nostri Deus; & sciemus in illo die, quia non ex operibus iustitiæ quæ fecimus nos, sed secundum suam misericordiam salvos nos fecit. *Bern. in Cant. Ser. 50.*

him. And elsewhere he expressly yeeldeth that Gods Commandements are more then any can fully and perfectly observe. *The Commander* (saith he) *was not ignorant, that the command did exceed mens strength, but he judged it profitable, that they should be admonished of their insufficiency, and that they should know, to what perfection of righteousness they ought to endeavour as they are able; Therefore by commanding things impossible, he did not make men prevaricators, but humble, that every mouth may be Stopped, and all the world may be subject unto God: because by the Workes of the Law shall no flesh be justified before him. For receiving the Commandment, and feeling a defect, wee shall cry to-*

wards Heaven, and God will have mercy on us; and we shall know in that day, that not by the Workes of righteousness that we have done, but according to his mercy he hath saved us.

Thus also some of the Church of Rome, that have written since *Luthers* time, have acknowledged, that none in this life are free from sinne, nor able to abide the judgement of God by their own righteousness, which is in effect to acknowledge that none doe perfectly keepe Gods Commandements. Thus

* Multum quidem peccatorum habent adhuc, sed nihil damnationis, quia apud Deum mundi reputantur propter fidem in Christum. *Ferus in Iob. 13 10.*

† Nemo enim quantumvis sanctus, immunis est à peccato, quamdiù vivit in hoc seculo. — Opus igitur habent quoridianà purgatione. *Ferus in Iob. 5.2.*

* Quare cum nemo sit perfectè iustus apud Deum, iusti & puri iudicii metus omnes terere debet. *Genebr. in Psal. 142. (vel. 143) 2.*

* *Ferus* speaking of such as are justified, saith that *they have indeed yet many sinnes, but no condemnation, because they are reputed cleane for their faith in Christ.* † And againe, *No man* (saith hee) *how holy soever, is free from sin, so long as hee lives in this World. Therefore all have need to be purged daily.* So also * *Genebrard*, Seeing (saith hee) that none is perfectly righteous before God, the fear of his just and pure judgement ought to affright all. That is his comment upon the words of *David*, Enter not into judgement with thy servant O Lord, &c. *Psal. 143. 2.* Now for those two places of Scripture, which the Mar-
quesse

queste alledgeth, they come farre short of proving that possibility of keeping Gods Commandements, which wee deny. As for that *Luk. 1.6.* it shewes indeed that *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth* had respect unto all Gods Commandements as all ought to have, *Psal. 119.6.* but it doth not shew, that they did perfectly keepe all Gods Commandements. *Hierome*

long agoe answered the *Pelagians* objecting these very persons, and others spoken of in Scripture as righteous, that they are called righteous, not that they were without fault, but because they were for most part vertuous. And I marvell how any can alledge the example of *Zacharias*, as one that did perfectly keep the Commandements, (though I know *Bellarmino* to this purpose doth alledge it) when as in that very Chapter, viz. *Luk. 1.* is related how hee sinned in not believing the message, which by an Angell God sent unto him, and how hee was punished, and became dumbe a long time for it. The other place, viz. *1 Joh. 5.3.* only shews that the Children of God do willingly and chearfully obey the will of God; not that they doe fully and perfectly obey it. I have rejoiced in the way of thy testimonies, saith *David*, *Psal. 119.14.* I will delight my selfe in thy statutes. *v. 1.6.* The Law of thy mouth is better unto me then thousands of gold and silver. *v. 72.* How sweet are thy words unto my taste? yea sweeter then hony to my mouth. *v. 103.* More to be desired are they then gold, yea then much fine gold; sweeter also then Hony, and the Hony combe, *Psal. 19.10.* yet presently hee addes, who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. *verf. 12.* And elsewhere hee complains, saying, Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to looke up: they are more then the haire of my head. *Psal. 40.12.* And againe, Iniquities prevaile against me. *Psal. 65.3.* And (as before noted) hee cryes out, Enter not into judgement with thy servant, &c. *Psal. 143. 2.* The History of his life recorded in Scriptures evidently shewes, that though Gods Commandements were as little grievous unto him, as to any, yet hee came short of a full and perfect observance of them.

The *Marqueffe* addes, *The Fathers are for us. Orig. Hom. 9. in Is. S. Cyrill lib. 4. contra Julian. S. Hil. in Psal. 118. S. Hieron. lib.*

Iusti appellantur, non quod omni vitio careant, sed quod majori parte virtutum commendentur. Hieron. adv. Pelagian. ad Ctesiphont.

Bell. de Iustific. lib. 4. cap. 11.

lib. 3. contra Pelag. S. Basil. But I have shewed already what little cause our adversaries have in this point to boast of the Fathers, and that both *Hierome*, whom the Marquesse here citeth, and also diverse others assert the same that wee doe. To those before mentioned I may adde another of these here alledged

† *Propheta in corpore positus loquitur, & neminem viventium scit sine peccato esse posse. Unum meminisse, qui peccatum non fecit, neque dolus inventus est in ore ejus. Hil. in Ps. 118. vel 119. v. 39.*

* *Latum igitur mandatum Dei est, &c. ut non difficile sit, si voluntas adsit, præcepto Dei obtemperare, Hil. in Psal. 118. (vel. 119.) 96.*

live without sinne) but which God will accept, as hee will that which is sincere, though it be imperfect. Otherwise even upon those very words * *Hilarie* sheweth that

* *Latum planè est (mandatum) quòd in infinitum cognitionem humanæ ignorantie excedit. Hil. Ibid.*

they infinitely exceeds the shallownesse of mans knowledge. If mans knowledge cannot reach to the full extent of Gods Commandements, much lesse can his practice doe it.

So that which *Hierome* saith, though it may seeme to be against us, yet indeed it is not. God (saith he) hath

Deus possibilia mandavit; hoc nulli dubium est. *Hier. advers. Pelag. l. 3.*

commanded things possible. (So the Pelagian objected, hee answers) *this none doubts of.*

Hee grants it; but how? No otherwise, for any thing I can see, then as wee doe grant it, viz. that God, if he please can give such a measure of grace unto men, as to inable them perfectly to doe all that is commanded.

* Sed quia homines possibilia non faciunt, ideo omnis mundus

subditus est Deo, & indiget misericordiâ ejus; aut certe si ostendere poteris, qui universa compleverit, tunc poteris demonstrare esse hominem; qui non indiget misericordiâ Dei. — Monstra factum esse de præterito, aut certe nunc fieri. *Hier. Ibid.*

shew any, that hath fulfilled all things required then thou canst shew one that doth not needs Gods mercy, shew that this hath been, or that it now is. So when Cyrill saith that even that precept, Thou shalt not covet, may be fulfilled by grace, hee doth not oppose us, nor wee him. For wee doubt not but God is able to give grace whereby to fulfill it; but wee deny that any (onely Christ excepted) ever had such grace as whereby to fulfill it. Basil is cited at large, no place being noted where he saith any thing about this point; onely in Bellarmine I finde that upon those words Take heed to thy selfe hee saith, that it is a wicked thing to say that the precepts of the Spirit are impossible. Which wee yeeld; so farre forth as any have the Spirit, they may performe them: but none have the Spirit in such full measure as to be able fully to performe whatsoever is commanded. Origen in the place cited, compares them to Women, who say that they cannot keepe Gods Commandements. Which must be understood of keeping them so as to have respect unto them, and to study and indeavour to keepe them. For otherwise if we speake of an exact and perfect keeping of the Commandements, both men and women, even the best upon Earth, are farre from it. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, (saith the Apostle) and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that you cannot do the things that you would. Gal. 5. 17.

*Bell. de Justifi.
lib. 4. cap. 12.*

Wee hold (saith the Marquesse) faith cannot justifye without workes. Yee say, good Workes are not absolutely necessary unto salvation. Wee have Scripture for what wee say. 1 Cor. 13. 2. Though I have all Faith, and have no Charity, I am nothing. And James 2. 24. By Workes a Man is justified, and not by Faith onely.

Page 65.

Answe. Protestants in opposition to them of the Church of Rome hold that Faith alone doth justifye, and that Workes doe not concurre with Faith unto justification. Yet withall they hold that Faith which doth justifye, is not alone without workes.

** Bellarmine confesseth that Calvin hath these very words,*

** Jo. Calvinus
in Antidoto
Concillii ad
can. 11. Sess. 6.*

Sola, inquit, fides est quæ justificat, sed fides tamen quæ justificat, non est sola. Sicut calor solis solus est, qui terram calefacit, ipse tamen calor non est solus in sole, sed cum splendore. Idem docent Philippus tum in locis, tum in Apologiâ confessi, Brennius in Catechismo, Chemnitius in Exam. Concilii, & alii. Bell. de justifi. lib. 1. cap. 14.

It is Faith alone that doth justify, but yet Faith which doth justify, is not alone. As the heat of the Sun alone is that which doth heat the Earth, yet heat is not alone in the Sun, but there is light also joyned with it. And hee addes that Melancthon, Brennius, Chemnitz, and other Protestants teach the same thing.

Therefore by *Bellarmine's* owne confession Protestants are no enemies unto good workes. Neither are they any whit injurious unto them in excluding them from having a share in justification, as the Romanists are injurious unto Faith in making workes copartners with it in that respect. *We conclude (saith S. Paul) That a Man is justified by Faith, without the deeds of the Law. Rom. 3. 28.* And in the next Chapter the Apostle proves by the example of *Abraham* that justification is by Faith without Workes. *For what saith the Scripture, Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Rom. 4. 3.* He confirms it also by the words of *David*; *Even as David also describes the blessednesse of the man, to whom God imputeth righteousness without Workes, saying, blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven, &c. Rom. 4. 6, 7, 8.* Mens workes are imperfect, and so is all that righteousness of man, that is inherent in him, as hath been shewed before: and therefore by his own workes, and his own righteousness can none be justified. *By the deeds of the Law shall no flesh be justified. Rom. 3. 20.* *Bellarmino* would have the Apostle, when hee excludes Workes from justification, onely to understand such workes as are done by the meere knowledge of the Law without grace. But this cannot be his meaning.

*Bell. de Justif.
lib. 1. cap. 19.*

For, 1. when *David* cried out, *Enter not into judgement with thy servant, O Lord, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified, Psal. 143. 2.* hee shewes that workes, whatsoever they be, are unable to justify a man in the sight of God. For it were most absurd and irrational to imagine that *David* then doth onely deprecate Gods entring into judgement with him in respect of the Works, which hee did without the assistance of Gods grace.

2. The Apostle proves that justification is by Faith without Workes, by that of *David*, *Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose finnes are covered: Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sinne. Rom. 4. 6, 7, 8.* Now the best man
that

that is upon Earth, hath need of this; that his iniquities may be forgiven, his finnes covered, and his transgressions not imputed unto him, seeing there is no man (as I have shewed before) but iniquities, finnes and transgressions are found in him. Therefore though a man be regenerate and sanctified, yet his workes are not such, as that he can be justified by them.

3. The Apostle *Gal. 3. 10.* proves that none can be justified by the deeds of the Law, because it is written, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the Law to doe them.* Now no man though indued with grace, and that in great measure, doth continue in all things that the Law requireth, as hath also been shewed before. Therefore Workes as well with grace, as without grace are unable to justify. But when our adversaries speake of justification, they equivocate, making it indeed the same with sanctification.

on. * *Duress* the Jesuite calles this new Divinity, to say, that by grace infused into us, wee get newnesse of life, and sanctification, but yet are not thereby justified. And hee askes what Scripture doth teach us to distinguish justification from sanctification.

Truly, I thinke that these two, viz, justification and sanctification, are sufficiently distinguished, *1 Cor. 6. 11.* *But you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified, in the Name of the Lord Iesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* There the Apostle shews that they were washed, viz. both from the staine of sinne by sanctification, which was wrought in them by the Spirit of God infusing grace into them, and also from the guilt of sinne by justification, which they obtained by faith in the Lord Iesus.

Besides, the Scripture opposeth justification to condemnation, and sheweth that to justify is as much as to absolve and acquit from guilt, to account and pronounce righteous. *Prov. 17. 15.* *He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just; even they both are an abomination to the Lord.* There to justify and to condemne are opposed one to the other; and to justify is to repute just, not to make just; for so it should be as abomination to justify the wicked, but a very good worke. For he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a

* Nova hęc, *Whitaker*, theologia est, nos per gratiam insulam, vitę novitatem, ac sanctitatem adipisci, minime tamen justificari. At quę te, obsecro, Scriptura docuit justificationem à sanctificatione distinguere? *Dur. contra Whitak.*

soules from death, &c. *James 5. 20.* So *Isai. 5. 23.* They are taxed, who justifie the wicked for a reward. Thus also God is said to justifie, *Isai. 50. 8.* Hee is neare that justifieth mee, who will contend with me? And *Rom. 8. 33, 34.* who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? it is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?

* Quando Deus justificat impium, declarando justum, facit etiam justum, quoniam judicium Dei secundum veritatem est. *Bel. de Iustif. l. 2. c. 3.*

it is Christ that died, &c. But (saith * *Belarmine*) when God doth justifie the wicked, by declaring him just, he doth also make him just: because the judgement of God is according to truth. I answer, true it is, whom

God doth justifie them also hee doth sanctifie, yet it doth not follow that these two, viz. to justifie, and to sanctifie are one and the same. *David* was a man truly sanctified, yet hee knew and acknowledged that his righteousness, whereby hee was sanctified, was not such, as that he could be justified by it, and therefore cried, *Enter not into judgement with thy servant; &c. Psal. 143. 2.* And, *Blessed is the man whose iniquity is forgiven, &c. Psal. 32. 1, 2.* yet is Gods judgement nevertheless according to truth, when hee accounteth those righteous, and imputeth no sinne unto them, who still have sinne in them, and so cannot be justified by their owne righteousness, because they whom God justifieth, by faith are united unto Christ, as members of his Body, and so Christs righteousness is their righteousness, and though not in themselves, yet in Christ they are compleatly righteous. He is called *The Lord our righteousness. 1er. 23. 6.* And sayes the Apostle, *In him yee are complete. Col. 2. 10.* wherefore hee desired to be found in him, not having his own righteousness, which is of the Law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness, which is of God by faith, *Phil. 3. 9.* And thus we hold that faith doth justifie, not formally, but instrumentally, not because of it selfe, but because of its object, viz. Christ and his righteousness, which faith apprehendeth and applieth. For by faith wee receive Christ. *Ioh. 1. 12.* And Christ doth dwell in our hearts by faith. *Ephes. 3. 17.* Diverse of the Church of *Rome* since the beginning of Reformation, in this great point touching justification have inclined to us. *Fernu* I cited before, saying that *Believers have yet much sinne, but no condemnation, because a thorough faith in Christ they are reputed cleane.* *Cardinall Com-*

are not his workes I have not, neither can I alledge him of mine own knowledge, but his words as I finde them cited by * another, are very full for our purpose. Because (saith hee) we come unto a twofold righteousness by faith, a righteousness inherent in us, &c. and the righteousness of Christ given, and imputed to us, in that we are ingrafted into Christ, and put on Christ, it remains to inquire, Whether of these we must rely upon, that we may be justified before God, that is accounted holy and just. I doe altogether hold, that it is piously and Christianly said, that we ought to reply, as on a thing that is stable, and doth surely support us, on the righteousness of Christ given unto us, and not on that holiness and grace, which is inherent in us. For this righteousness of ours is but inchoated and imperfect; Which cannot preserve us so, but that in many things we offend, and sinne continually. Therefore for this righteousness of ours we cannot be accounted righteous and good in the sight of God, so as it should become the sonnes of God to be good and holy. But the righteousness of Christ given unto us is true and perfect righteousness, which doth altogether please the eyes of God, in which there is nothing that may offend God, nothing which cannot fully please him. On this therefore alone, as sure and stable, must we rely, and for it alone must we believe that we are justified before God, that is, accounted and called just. I see not why we should desire more in point of justification then this amounts to. Pighius also a stout Champion of the Church of Rome, is as full and expresse for that, which we make the formall cause of justification, as any can be. It is cleare (saith hee) What sentence we should all have, if God would have dealt with us in strict judgement: if hee had not most mercifully succoured us in his Son, and had not involved and wrapped us in his righteousness, we having none of our own that will serve our turne. And againe, In him therefore are we justified, not in our selves; not with our own, but with his righteousness, which by reason of our communion with Him is imputed unto us. Being empty of our owne righteousness we are taught to seeke righte-

* Amesius a-
gainst Bellar-
mine lib. 6. de
Iustif. cap.
1. Thess. 1.

Constat planè quæ de nobis omnibus foret sententia, si Deus voluisset districto nobiscum judicio agere: si non misericordissimè nobis succurrisset in filio, & nostrâ justitiâ vacuos ejus involvisset justitiâ. Pigh. de fide & justifi. controu. 2.

In illo ergo justificamur coram Deo non in nobis; non nostrâ, sed illius justitiâ, quæ nobis cum illo communicantibus imputatur. Propriæ justitiæ inopes, extra nos in illo docemur justitiâ querere. Pigh. Ibid.

† In Christi autem obedientia, quod nostra collocatur iustitia, inde est, quod nobis illi incorporatis, ac si nostra esset, accepta ea ferretur, ita ut eā ipsā etiam nos iusti habeamur. Et velut ille quondam *Isaac*, quum nativitate primogenitus non esset, sub habitu fratris occultatus, atque ejus veste indutus, quæ odorem optimum spirabat, seipsum insinavit patri, ut sub alienā personā benedictionem primogenituræ acciperet: Ita & nos sub Christi primo geniti fratris nostri pretiosa puritate delitescere, bono ejus odore fragrare, ejus perfectione vita nostra sepeliri, & obtegi, atque ita nos pissimo patri ingerere, ut iustitiæ benedictionem ab eodem aalequamur necesse est. *Pigh. ibid.*

enfused out of our selves in him. † And againe, That our righteousness is placed in Christs obedience, it is from hence, that wee being incorporated into Him, it is reckoned as if it were ours, so that because of it we are accounted righteous. And immediately he adds, that as Jacob being clothed with the robes of his elder brother, obtained the blessing of his Father: so we must be clothed with the righteousness of Christ our elder brother, that God may bestow the blessing of justification upon us.

* Justificat ergo nos Deus patet bonitate suā gratiā, quā nos in Christo complectitur, dum eidem inseros innocentia & iustitiā Christi nos induit: quæ una ut vera, & perfecta est, quæ Dei sustinere conspectum potest, ita unam pro nobis sibi oportet tribunali Divini iudicii, &c. *Pigh. Ibid.*

** And againe, God doth justify us (saith he) of his free-goodnes, whereby he doth embrace us in Christ, whiles that he clothes us being ingrafted into him with Christs innocency and righteousness: which as it is alone true and perfect, able to endure the sight of God, so it alone must be presented for us at the tribunall of Gods Judgement.*

Quoniam dissimulare non possumus, hanc primam Doctrinæ Christianæ partem, obsecratam, quàm illustratam magis, à scholasticis, ipsiusque plerisque questionibus, & definitionibus, secundum quos nonnulli primam in omnibus auctoritatem sibi arrogantes, & de omnibus facili pronuntiantes, forsassis etiam nostram hanc damnarent sententiam, quā propriam, & quæ ex suis operibus esset, coram Deo iustitiam, derogamus omnibus Adæ filiis, & docuimus unā Dei in Christo niti nos posse iustitiā, unā illā iustos esse coram Deo, destitutos propriā, nisi hoc ipsum astruxissemus aliquando diligentiū, *Pigh. Ibid.*

This, and much more to this purpose hath *Pighius*, and hee saith that hee could not dissemble that this prime part of Christian Doctrinæ was rather obscured, then illustrated by the Schoolemen, with thorny questions and definitions, and therefore he was the more diligent in the handling of this point, shewing that none of the sons of *Adam* can be justified before God by their own righteousness, and their own workes, but that all must rely onely on the righteousness of God in Christ, and that by it alone they being destitute of a righteousness of their owne, are righteous before God

God. *Pighlar* is so plaine, and home in this point, that *Bellar-* Bell. de Iustif.
minus doth censure him as erroneous in it. And yet so powerfull l.2.c.1.
 and prevalent is truth, that it extorted even from *Bellarmino*

himselfe this confession, *That because of the uncertainty of a mans owne righteousness, and the danger of vaine glory it is most safe to repose all confidence only in Gods Mercy and Goodnesse.* By his own confession then it is most safe in matter of justification to renounce

Workes, and to flie onely to Faith in the Lord Jesus. The ancient Fathers also give testimony to this truth. *Hilarie* hath these very words, *Fides sola iustificat, i. e. Faith alone doth iustifie.*

Hil. in Mat. can. 8.

† *Austine* in effect sayes the same, when hee saith, *Our righteousness in this life is so great, that it consists rather in forgiveness of sinnes, then in perfection of vertues.* And so when hee saith, *Woe even to the laudable life of men; if thou (O Lord) laying aside mercy shall enter into the examination of it.* To this purpose also is that which hee saith upon those words of *David*, *Enter not into judgement with thy servant O Lord, &c. How right soever (saith hee) I thinke my selfe, thou bringest forth a rule out of thy treasure, and triest me by it, and I am found crooked.* Thus also * *Bernard*, *Lord (saith he) I will make mention of thy righteousness onely; for it also is mine, seeing that thou of God art made unto me righteousness.* *Adust* I feare lest this one righteousness will not suffice us both? No, it is not a short cloake, that cannot cover two. And againe, *It is sufficient for me unto all righteousness, to have him onely propitious, against whom onely I have sinned. Not to sinne is Gods righteousness, mans righteousness is Gods indulgence.* Thus then in the point of justification wee have both Scriptures and Fathers: yea and divers Papists

Propter incertitudinem propriæ iustitiæ, & periculum inanis gloriæ tutissimum est fiduciam totam in solâ Dei misericordiâ & benignitate reponere. Bell. de Iustif. lib. 5. cap. 7.

† *Tanta est iustitia nostra in hac vitâ, ut potius remissione peccatorum constet, quàm perfectione virtutum.* Aug. de Civit. Dei lib. 19. cap. 22.

Vz etiam laudabili vitæ hominum, si remota misericordiâ discutias eam. Aug. Confess. lib. 9. cap. 13.

Quantumlibet rectus mihi videar, producis tu de thesauro tuo regulam, & coaptas me ad eam, & pravus invenior. Aug. in Psal. 142. (vel 143.) 2.

* *Domine memorabor iustitiæ tuæ solius; ipsa enim est & mea. Nempe factus es mihi tu iustitia à Deo. Numquid mihi verendum, ne non una ambobus sufficiat? Non est pallium breve, quod non possit operire duos.* Bern. in Can. Ser. 61.

Sufficit mihi ad omnem iustitiam solum habere propitium, cui soli peccavi. Non peccare Dei iustitia est, hominis iustitia, indulgentia Dei. Bern. in Can. Ser. 23.

also concurring with us. As for the two places of Scripture alledged by the Marquesse; the former, *viz.* that 1 *Corin.* 13. 2. speaketh not of justifying Faith, but of a Faith of working miracles, as is cleare by the words themselves being fully cited. which run thus, *Though I have all faith, so that I could remove*

* Πίστιν ἢ καὶ τὴν τῶν πιστῶν τὴν κοινὴν ἢ καθολικὴν λέγει, ἀλλὰ τὸ χάρισμα τὸ τῆς πίστεως. ἢ γὰρ τὸ χάρisma? &c. *Oecumen.*
1 *Cor.* 13.

† Re& Græci eam intelligunt fidem, de quâ *cap.* 13. Si habuere omnem fidem, &c. Græci fidem signorum, & miraculorum appellant. Et hæc fides secundum se; tantum est gratia gratis data, hoc est, ad aliorum utilitatem propriè concessa, &c. *Estius ad 1 Cor.* 12. 9.

* *Oecumenius* upon the place notes that by Faith there is not meant that Faith, which is common to all Believers, but a Faith peculiar to such as had the gift of working miracles. And though † *Estius* (a learned Romanist) in his Commentary upon the place seeke to draw it another way, yet commenting upon 1 *Cor.* 12. 9. hee saith that the Greeke Expositors doe rightly understand it of that Faith, which is spoken of *Chap.* 13. *If I have all Faith, &c.* that is, of the Faith of signes, and miracles, as they call it, which Faith (hee saith) is not properly a sanctifying grace, but onely such a grace as is given for the benefit of others.

The other place, *viz.* *Jam.* 2. 24. doth seeme to make against us, but indeed it doth not. For S. *James* saying that *a man is justified by Workes, and not by Faith onely*, means onely thus, as

* Non fide sterili, sed fecundâ operibus justificamur. *Cajetan: in Jac.* 2.

* *Cajetan* himselfe doth expound it, that we are not justified by a barren Faith, but by a Faith, which is fruitfull in good Workes.

This appeares to be his meaning by his whole discourse from *vers.* 14. to the end of the Chapter, wherein hee bends himselfe, against those, who presume of such a faith as is without workes: and more specially, it may appeare by the verses immediately preceding, wherein hee saith, that *Abraham* was justified by workes, when hee offered up *Isaac*; and that Faith wrought with his workes, and by workes was Faith made perfect: and the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness.* Now this clearly shewes that *Abraham* was justified by Faith; and not by workes, onely his workes did shew, that his Faith was a

true justifying Faith indeed, and not, as it is in many that pretend and profess Faith, a vaine shew of Faith, and a mere shadow of it. For that, which *S. James* cireth, *Abraham beliveth God*, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness, was, as appeares by the story in the booke of *Genesis*, long before that *Abraham* offered up *Isaac*; and by those very words *Saint Paul* proveth, *Rom. 4.* that wee are justified by Faith, and not by Workes. Therefore when *S. James* saith that by *Abrahams* offering up of *Isaac* that Scripture was fulfilled, the meaning is, that thereby it did appeare that it was truly said of *Abraham*, that hee believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness, his readinesse in that worke to obey God, did demonstrate that hee believed God indeed; and that his faith was of a right stampe. Thus also is it said, that by workes faith was made perfect, viz. even as the Lord said unto *Paul*, *My strength is made perfect in weaknesse*, 2 *Cor. 12.9.* that is, Gods strength doth exercise it selfe, and shew how great it is, in mans weaknesse. So *Abrahams* workes did shew how great his faith was; in this sense his workes did make his faith perfect, not that they did adde any thing unto it, no more then mans weaknesse doth adde unto Gods strength.

This opinion of yours (saith the Marquesse) S. Aug. de fide & oper. cap. 14. saith was an old herese, in the Apostles time: and in the Preface of his comment upon the 32. Psalm he calles it the right way to hell, and damnation. See Origin 5. to the Rom. S. Hilary. chap. 7. in Mat. S. Ambr. 4. and Heb.

To Answ. * *Augustine de fid. & oper. c. 14.* speaks nothing against our Opinion, but something for it. That which hee speaketh by way of reproofe is against those, who so thinke that Faith alone will suffice, as that they heede not to doe good workes, nor to order their life and conversation aright. But this is nothing to us, who are farre from holding such a Faith as that sufficient. But in the same place *Augustine* hath this for our purpose: that when the Apostle saith that a Man is justified by Faith without the Workes of the Law, hee did not intend that the Workes

* *Quare jam illud videamus, quod excutiendum est à cordibus religiosi, ne malà securitate salutem suam perdant, si ad eam obtinendam sufficere solam fidem putaverint, bene autem vivere, & bonis operibus viam Dei tenere neglexerint. Aug. de fid. & oper. c. 14.*

Cum ergo dicit Apostolus, arbitrari se justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus legis, non hoc agit, ut præcepta & professâ fide opera justitiæ condemnantur, sed ut sciat se quisque per fidem posse justificari, etiam si legis opera non præcesserint. Sequuntur enim justificarum, non præcedunt justificandum, *Aug. Ibid.*

of Righteousness should be contemned, but that every one should know, that hee may be justified by faith, though the workes of the Law did not goe before. For (saith hee) *they follow a man being justified, they doe not goe before a man being to be justified.* If (as this Father affirmeth) a man must first be justified, before hee can doe good workes; then good workes are no cause of justification, but an effect of it. For the other place of *Aufine*, which the Marquese alledgeth, there is none such, that I can finde, viz. no preface of his comment upon *Psal. 32.* but in the comment it selfe

Non audisti Apostolum, Justus ex fide vivet? Fides tua, justitia tua. *Aug. in Psal. 32.*

I finde this, which makes for us. *Doeſt thou not heare the Apostle, The just shall live by Faith? Thy faith is thy righteousness.* What *Origen* saith on *Rom. 5.* having not

his workes now at hand, I cannot tell; but I see what *Bellarmino* cites out of him on *Rom. 4.* and perhaps so it should have been in the Marquese his writing. However there is no doubt but *Bellarmino* would have made use of it, if there had been any thing more for his purpose on *Rom. 5.* Now on *Rom. 4.* *Origen*

Credientibus quidem Christo, nec tamen deponentibus veterem hominem cum actibus suis, fides reputari non potest ad justitiam. *Ori. in Rom. 4. citat. a Bell. de Justif. lib. 1. cap. 25.*

saith, that *whose believe Christ, but doe not put off the old man with his deeds, their faith cannot be imputed unto them for righteousness.* This wee doe easily assent unto, it being our professed opinion (as hath beene shewed before by *Bellarmino*'s owne confession)

that though faith alone doe justify, yet if it be such a faith as is alone, and is not accompanied with good workes, it is not that faith, which doth justify. As little is that of *Hilarie*

Salus gentium omnis in fide est, & in præceptis Domini vita est universorum. *Hil. cap. 7. in Mat.*

against us, *The safety of the Nations is all in faith; and the life of all is in Gods Precepts.* That faith, which alone doth justify, is not so alone, but that there is joynd with it

a care and indeavour to observe all Gods Precepts. Of the same nature is that of *† Ambrose* (if *Ambrose* were the Author of *†* *Sola fides non sufficit, operari per dilectionem fidem necessarium est, & conversari digne Deo.* — Non sufficit fides, sed debet addi & vita candida, & multum studium debet adhiberi, ne fides sit otiosa. *Ambros. in Heb. 4.*

those

those commentaries) Faith alone is not sufficient ; it is necessary that faith worke by love, and that men walke worthy of God. Faith is not sufficient, but there must also be added a life answerable, and much care must be had, that faith be not idle. All this wee hold, that faith must not be idle, but operative, and working through love ; and such is the nature of true justifying faith, as the Apostle teacheth, *Gal. 5. 6.* But all this is nothing against justification by faith alone without workes, viz. as concurring unto justification.

In the next place the Marquesse pleades for the merit of good workes ; and that from *Mat. 6. 27.* (so it is printed, but it should be *Mat. 16. 27.*) *Hee shall reward every man according to his workes.* And *Mat. 5. 12.* *Great is your reward in Heaven. Reward at the end.* (saith he) presupposes merit in the worke : the distinction of *secundum*, and *propter opera*, is too nice to make such a division in the Church.

Ans. But that mens good workes doe not merit any reward at the hands of God, our Saviour hath sufficiently shewed, saying, *When yee have done all things, that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants ; wee have done but what our duty was to do.* *Luke 17. 10.* If (as † *Theophylact* notes upon the place) when wee have done all things that are commanded us, we must take heede of thinking highly of our selves : how much more ought wee to be farre from such presumption, when as wee are so farre from obeying all Gods Commandements ! Besides, if we doe any thing that is good, wee doe it not of our selves, by our own strength, but it is God that doth inable us, and make us to doe it : and therefore properly wee cannot merit by it ; for wee are beholding unto God, and not God beholding unto us for it. *I have laboured more abundantly then they all, yet not I, but the grace of God, that was with mee,* saith the Apostle, *1 Cor. 15. 10.* Again, the reward which the godly receive in Heaven, doth infinitely exceede their workes, and therefore cannot bee merited by them. The most that wee can doe, is to suffer for the Name of Christ ; yet the sufferings of this present life are not worthy to

ἢ εἰ δὲ καὶ ὅταν πᾶσας τὰς ἐντολάς ποιήσωμεν, ἐδὲ τότε ὀφείλομεν εἰδᾶν τι μέγα, τί γενομένη, ὅταν μὴδὲ τὰ πολλὰ ὁν μέρει τῶν ἐντολῶν τῷ θεῷ καλοῦντες εἰς ἐπαίρημα ; *Theophylact Luc. 17. 10.*

be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us. Rom. 8. 18. Both these reasons doth Bernard alledge against merits. The merits of men (saith hee) are not such, as that because of them life

Neque enim talia sunt hominum merita, ut propter ea vita æterna debeatur ex jure, aut Deus injustam aliquam faceret, nisi eam donaret. Nam ut taceam quod merita omnia sunt dona Dei, & ita homo magis propter ipsa Deo debitor est, quam Deus homini; quid sunt merita, omnia ad tantam gloriam? Bernardi Annot. B. Mariae Serm. 1.

Gratia autem etiam ipsa (sc. vita æterna) non injuste dicitur, quia non solum donis suis Deus dona sua reddit, sed quia tantum etiam tibi gratia Divinæ retributionis exsuperat, ut incomparabiliter, æque ineffabiliter omne meritum quamvis bonum, & ex Deo datæ humanæ voluntatis, atque operationis excedat. Fulgentii ad Monim. libi 1.

Quod si illa sanctorum felicitas misericordia est & non meritis acquiritur, ubi erit quod scriptum est, Et tu reddes, unicuique secundum opera sua?

Si secundum opera redditur, quomodo misericordia æstimabitur? Sed aliud est secundum opera reddere, & aliud præter ipsa opera reddere. In eo. n. quod secundum opera dicitur, ipsa operum qualitas intelligitur, ut cuius apparuerint bona opera, ipse sit & retributio gloriosa. Illi namque beatæ vitæ, in quâ cum Deo, & de Deo vivitur, nullus potest æquum labor, nulla opera comparari, præsertim cum Apostolus dicat, Non sunt condignæ passionibus huius temporis ad futuram gloriam, quæ revelabitur in nobis. Quanquam & ex hoc quoque misericordia jure possit nominari, quia pro illis operibus datur, quæ sine præteritu misericordiae Dei nemo assequitur. Gregor. 7. penult. Et sic in Rf. 1. 13. 9.

eternal life should be due unto them of right, so that God should doe them wrong if hee should not give it. For to say nothing of this, that all merits are Gods gifts, and so man is rather indebted unto God for them, then God unto man; what are all merits unto so great glory? Here Bernard useth indeed the word merits, but so as that hee plainly denieth the thing, which our adversaries understand by it, and by a double argument confuteth their opinion. Both these arguments also to this purpose, before Bernard did Fulgentius use, who speaking of eternall life; saith, It is not unjustly called grace, because not onely God doth recompense his gifts with his gifts, but because the grace of Gods retribution doth so abound, that it incomparably and ineffably exceeds all the merits of mans will and works, though it be good, and such as God hath given. To this purpose hee cites Rom. 8. 18. and

2 Cor. 4. 17. And Gregorius Magnus not onely useth these same Arguments against the Merits of good works, but also lieth that very distinction of secundum opera, and præter opera, which the Marquesse so much disdained. If (saith Gregorius) the happiness of the Saints be mercy, and be not acquired by Merits, where is that which is written, Thou wilt render to every one according to his works? If it be rendered according to works, how shall it be accounted mercy? But it is one thing to render according

in workes, and another thing to render, because of the workes themselves. In that there is a rendering according to workes, the quality of workes is considered, so as that whose workes are found to be good, his reward also shall be glorious. Even unto that blessed life, in which wee live with God, and of God; no labour can be equall, no workes comparable, especially when as the Apostle saith, The sufferings of this present time are not worthy of that glory, which shall be revealed in us. Besides also in this respect it may be justly called mercy, because it is given for those workes, which none can attain unto without the premission of Gods mercy. Thus Gregorie, who above a thousand yeeres agoe was Bishop of Rome, both argues for us, and also by a distinction answers that which is objected against us, viz. that God doth render to all according to their workes. And for the word reward, which the Scripture often useth, it doth not presuppose merit; for a reward may proceede from the bounty of the giver, not from the merit of the receiver. They that wrought but one houre in the Vineyard, though they received a penny, as much as they that laboured all the day, though (I say) they received this is the reward of their labour, yet did they not merit it by their labour. This very parable doth *Propter* (or who ever was the Author of the Booke de *voluntate gentium*) apply in this manner; without

doubts (suchlike) they that were sent into the Vineyard at the eleventh houre, and were made equall with those that wrought the whole day, represent the condition of those whom to commend the excellency of graces Gods goodness doth reward in the end of the day, and in the conclusion of life, not paying the price of labour, but pouring out the riches of his bounty upon them, whom he hath chosen without labour; that so they also, who have endured much labour, and yet have received no more then they that were last, may understand, that they have received the gift of grace, not the reward (viz. the deserved reward) of their workes. Thus both Scriptures and Fathers are against the opinion of the Church of Rome as touching Merit. I will add to what hath been already al-

Sine dubio horum undecima intromissi in vineam, & totius diei operantis exaequari, illorum praefertur sortem, quos ad commendandam gratiae excellentiam in deserto diei, & conclusionem vitae divina indulgentia muneratur; non labori premium solvens, sed divitias bonitatis suae in eos, quos sine laboribus elegit, effundens; ut etiam hi, qui in multo labore sudant, nec amplius quam novissimi, acceperunt, intelligant donum se gratiae, non operum accepisse mercedem. De vera gen. lib. 1. 17.

* Meritum proinde meum miseratione Domini. Non plane suum meriti inops, quamdiu miserationum ille non fuerit. *Bern. in Cant. Serm. 61.*

his own, but meerly Gods mercy. And this was it that *Nebemiah* did the unto, even when hee recorded the good that hee had done, *Remember me O Lord* (said hee) concerning this, and (what ? reward mee according to the greatnesse of my merit ? no, but) *spare mee according to the greatnesse of thy mercy.* Neh. 13.22.

* Sufficit ad meritum scire quod non sufficient merita. *Bern. in Cant. Serm. 68.*

Si Dei gratiam & favorem conservare cupis, nullam tuorum meritorum fac mentionem : ex misericordia enim cuncta donare vult. *Ferus in Mat. 10. 1.*

* Bellarmine also saith that *Bernard*, prudenter non confidebat in meritis suis, sed in sola misericordia Domini, did wisely not trust in his merits, but only in Gods mercy. *Bell. de Justif. lib. 5. cap. 6.*

ledged, that of * *Bernard*, Thy merit is Gods mercy. I am not altogether without merit, so long as hee is not without mercy. See what merit it is that hee builds upon, no merit of

his own, but meerly Gods mercy. And this was it that *Nebemiah* did the unto, even when hee recorded the good that hee had done, *Remember me O Lord* (said hee) concerning this, and (what ? reward mee according to the greatnesse of my merit ? no, but) *spare mee according to the greatnesse of thy mercy.* Neh. 13.22.

* *Bernard* to this purpose againe, It is enough unto merit, to know that merits are not sufficient. The Romish Doctrine of merits

die not please *Ferus*, a late member of that Church; If thou wouldest keepe (saith hee) the grace and favour of God, make no mention of thy Merits : for God will give all things out of mercy.

* *Bellarmino* himselfe, though hee disputed eagerly for Merits, yet (it seemes) durst not rely on them, confessing (as was shewed before) that it is the safest course to put our whole trust meerely in Gods Mercy. But the Marquesse saith that the Fathers were

of their opinion, citing *Ambrose de apol. David. cap. 6. Hieron. lib. 3. contra Pelag. Aug. de Spir. & lit. cap. ult.*

And first for *Ambrose* in the place cited, it's true, hee speakes merits ; but here wee must remember what one of their owne

† Quamvis ipsa iustitia, & peccatorum remissio non possint proprie merces vocari respectu fidei, poenitentiae, & c. attamen veteres theologi meriti nomen memoratis operibus respectu justificationis, ac peccatorum remissionis passim ascribunt, excuso utq. meriti nomen ad illud quod recentiores congruum vocant, id est, ad impetrationem *Estius ad Heb. 1. 26.*

writers doth tell us, namely † *Estius*, that the ancient Divines did often use the word *Merit* very largely, and not properly. And thus did *Ambrose* use the word, saying, *Habet quis bona Merita*, one hath good Merits, that is, good workes, which hee calles Merits, because they doe impetrate or obtaine a reward, though not properly merit it, the ancients (as *Estius* observes) using merit for impetration. But that *Ambrose* there did not make good workes to be truly and

pro-

properly meritorious, appears by the words immediately following, *habes & vitia, atque peccata; hee hath also vices and sins.* Now surely those good workes, which have vices and finnes mixed with them, cannot be properly meritorious: in that case there is great need to crave mercy, but no cause to plead merit. For *Hierome lib.3. contra Pelag.* I finde nothing at all, that doth so much as seeme to asseert merits, except perhaps those words,

here (in this life) is labour, and striving: there (in the life to come) is the reward of labour, and vertue. But reward doth not alwayes presuppose merit, as I have shewed before.

Mercy, I am sure, and merit are inconsistent, and *Hierome* in that very Book which the Marquesse citeth, plainly testifieth that there is no man, whose workes are so good, and his obedience so perfect, but that still hee hath need of Gods mercy. And hee taxeth his adversarie (*Pelagius*. I thinke) as proud and Pharisaeall for saying that he doth worthily lift up his hands to God, and doth pray with a good conscience, who can say, *Thou, O Lord, knowest, how holy, how innocent, how pure from all fraud, injury, and rapine the hands are, that I spread forth unto thee; how just, immaculate, and free from all lying the lips are, with which I purre forth prayers unto thee, that thou mayest have mercy on mee.* Hee tells him that *David* sung another Song, saying, *My wounds stinke and are corrupt because of my foolishnesse, Psal. 38.*

5. Enter not into judgement with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified. *Psal. 143.2.*

And that *Esay* lamented saying, *Woe is mee, for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, &c. Isai. 6.5.* * And hee askes rancieque jaçantiam, & confidentiam sanctitatis, quasi stultus stultis persuadere conaris, ut in extremo dicas, quibus tibi, ut mihi miserearis, preces fundo. Si sanctus es, si innocens, si ab omni sorde purgatus, si nec sermone, nec opere peccasti, discente Iacobo, Qui in verbo non peccat, iste perfectus est vir; & nemo potest refrénare linguam suam; quomodo misericordiam deprecaris, &c. *Ibid.*

Uti hic labor sit, atque contentio, ibi laboris virtutisque præmium. Hieron. contra Pelag. lib. 3. cap. 5.

* Quia homines possibili non faciunt, ideo omnis mundus subditus est Deo, & indiget misericordiâ ejus. Aut certe si ostendere poteris, qui universi compleverit, tunc poteris demonstrare esse hominem, qui non indiget misericordiâ Dei. *Hieron. Ibid. cap. 1.*

Ille, inquis, merito ad Deum extollit manus, ille preces bonâ conscientia fundit, qui potest dicere, Tu enim nosti, Domine, quàm sanctæ, quàm innocentes, quàm puræ sint ab omni fraude, & injuriâ, & rapinâ, quas ad te expando; manus; quàm justæ, quàm immaculatæ labia, & ab omni mendacio libera, quibus tibi, ut mihi miserearis, preces fundo. Christiani est hæc, an Pharisæi superbientis oratio? *Hieron. Ibid. cap. 5. David loquitur, &c. Ibid.*

Esaïas plangit. &c. Ibid.

* Et post tantum tumorem, o-

him,

him, how after all this swelling and boasting of himselfe, after all this confidence of his holinesse, hee could pretend to desire Gods mercy? For if hee were so holy, and innocent, so pure and perfect, then he had no neede to pray in that manner, viz. that God should have mercy on him. This and more to this purpose hath *Hierome* in the place alledged, but whether this be for Merits, or against them, is easie to iudge.

*Consequens esse video, ut omni homini sit necessarium dare, ut deus illi, dimittere, ut dimittatur illi; & si quid habet iustitiae, non de suo sibi esse presumere, sed de gratia iustificantis Dei, & adhuc tamen ab illo elucere, & sustinere iustitiam, qui est panis & vinum, & apud quem fons vitae, qui sic operatur iustificationem in sanctis suis in huius vitae sententia laborantibus, ut tamen sit, & quod potentibus largiter adjiciat, & quod confitentibus clementer ignoscat. Sed inveniant isti, si possunt, aliquem sub onere corruptionis huius viventem, cui iam non habeat Deus quod ignoscat. *Aug. de Spir. & lit. cap. ult.*

Donna sua coronat Deus, non merita sua. *Aug. de gen. & lib. arb. c. 6.*

Page 66.

The Marquess goes on, saying, we hold that Faith once had may be lost, if wee have not care to preserve it, you say it cannot, we have Scripture for it, viz. Luke 8. 13. They on the Rock are they, which when they heare, receive the Word with joy, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away. So 1 Tim. 1. 18, 19. which some having put away have made shipwrecke of their Faith.

Answ. We doe not hold that Faith cannot be lost, though a man have no care to preserve it; but that God will worke such a care in those, in whom hee hath wrought true justifying Faith, that they shall never lose it. I will put my feare (saith hee) in their

Neither hath * *Anselm* in the place, which the Marquess citeth, any thing (that I can see) to prove good workes meritorious, but something to prove the contrary. For having cited many places of Scripture, which shew that none is so righteous as to be without sinne, hee saith, Hence it followeth, that it is necessary for every one to forgive, that hee may be forgiven: and if hee have any righteousness, not to presume that he hath it of his own, but to ascribe it to Gods grace; and still to hunger and thirst for righteousness from God, who doth so work in his Saints, whilst they are in this life, as that hee hath still something to add to them that aske, and to pardon them that confesse. For that none living in this mortall body can be found so holy, but that still hee hath neede of pardon. And elsewhere he saith, God doth crowne his own gifts, not by merits.

their hearts, that they shall not depart from me. Jer. 31. 40. Christ prayed for Peter, that his faith might not faile, Luke 22. 32. And so he prayed both for him and others, even for all that belong unto him. I pray for them (saith he) I pray not for the World, but for them, which thou hast given me: for they are thine. Joh. 17. 9. And vers. 11. Holy Father, keepe through thine own name, those whom thou hast given mee. So the Apostle telleth us, that whom God did predestinate, them hee also called (viz. according to his purpose, vers. 18.) and whom hee called, them hee also justified; and whom hee justified, them hee also glorified. Rom. 8. 30. This clearly shewes, that all that are once justified, shall certainly be glorified, and consequently that justifying faith once had cannot be quite lost. Again, They that truly believe, are the sons of God. Gal. 3. 26. Now the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the son abideth ever. Joh. 8. 35. Therefore true Faith cannot be lost; the children of God cannot fall away. And to this doe the Fathers accord. Cyprian is much to this purpose; *The strength of such as are truly faithfull, doth remaine unmovable, and the integrity of those that feare God, and love him with the whole heart, doth continue stable and strong.* And again, *The Lord, who is the protector and defender of his people, doth not suffer wheat to be taken away out of his store: onely chaffe can be separated from the Church.*

And againe, *Let none thinke that the good can depart out of the Church. The Winde doth not carry away the wheat; neither doth the storme overthrow the Tree; that hath taken solid roote. The empty chaffe is tossed with the tempest: the weak Trees are throwne down with the whirlwinde. This the Apostle John doth curse, and smite, saying, They went out from us, but they were not of us: for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us.* 1 Joh. 2. 19. And to adde one testimony of his more, *See, I have heard* (hee) *speaking for all, and answering in the name of the Church,*

Manet verè fidelium robur immobile, & apud timentes ac diligentes toto cordet Deum stabilis; ac fortis perseverat integritas. Cyp. Epist. 52.

Non patitur Dominus populi sui protector & tutor, triticum de arca sua diripi, sed sola possunt paleæ de ecclesiâ separari. Cyp. Epist. 69.

Nemo existimet bonos de ecclesiâ posse discedere. Triticum non rapit ventus; nec arborem solidâ radice fundatam procella subvertit. Inanes paleæ tempestate jactantur; invalidæ arbores turbine incurfione evertuntur. Hoc execrator & percutit Joannes Apostolus dicens, Ex nobis exierunt. Ecce Cyp. de unit. Eccl.

Petrus cum pro omnibus loquens, & Ecclesie voce respondens, ait, Domine, ad quem ibimus? verba vitæ, &c. significans scilicet qui à Christo recesserint, culpâ suâ perire: Ecclesiam tamen, quæ in Christum credit, & quæ semel id, quod cognoverit, teneat, nunquam omnino ab eo discedere: & eos esse Ecclesiam, qui in domo Dei permanent, plantationem verò à Deo Patre non esse, quos videmus non frumenti stabilitate solidari, sed tanquam paleas dissipandas inimici spiritu ventulari. De quibus ait Joannes in Epistola, Ex nobis exierunt, &c. *Cyp. Epist. 55.*

* Non ait quod exeundo alieni facti sunt, sed quod alieni erant, propter hoc eos exiisse declaravit. *Aug. de baptis. contra Donatist. lib. 3. cap. 19.*

Bo ipso quod discedis, & volas, paleam te esse indicas: qui triticum sunt, ferunt: tritici autem. *Aug. in Ps. 140.*

Tunc verè sunt quod appellantur, si manserint in eo, propter quod sic appellantur. *Aug.*

Non est revera Domini corpus, quod cum illo non erit in æternum. *Aug. de doct. Christ. lib. 3. cap. 32.*

* Neque fideles, quos hæresis potuerit deponere. — Nemo Christianus, nisi qui ad finem usque perseveraverit. Tu ut homo extrinsecus unumquemque nostris putas quod vides; vides autem quovis oculos habes. Sed oculi Domini alti. Homo in faciem, Deus in præcordia contempletur. Et ideo cognoscis Dominum

*saith, Lord to whom shall we goe? Thou hast the words of eternall life, (Joh. 6. 68.) signifying that they who depart from Christ, perish through their own fault: but that the Church, which believeth in Christ, and once holdeth that, which it hath knowne, doth never altogether depart from him; and that they are the Church, who doe abide in the house of God: but that they are not the planting of God the Father, whom wee see not to be strengthened with the stability of wheat, but to be blowne away with the breath of the enemy like chaffe, that is to be dissipated. Of whom John saith They went out from us, but they were not of us, &c. * Augustine also citing those words of S. John, saith, Hee doth not say, that by going out they were made Aliens, but that therefore they went out because they were Aliens. Again, In that (saith he) thou departest, and sleepest away, thou sewest thy selfe to be chaffe: they that are Wheate, endure threshing. And upon those words of our Saviour, If ye continue in my word, then you are my Disciples indeed; Joh. 8. 31. hee saith thus, Then they are indeed that which they are called, if they continue in that, for which they are so called.*

So againe, *That is not indeed the Body of Christ (saith hee) which shall not be with him for ever.*

So * *Tertullian saith that such as fall away were never true Believers, and true Christians. Hee saith, man sees the outside of every one, and thinks what hee sees; but God sees into the heart, and therefore knowes who are his; and roots out every Plant, that hee hath not planted. And let the chaffe of light saith (saith hee) slee away*

as much as it will with every blast of temptations, by so much will the heape of Corne be the more cleane to be laid up in the Lords Garners. Did not some of Christs Disciples, being offended, turne away? yet the rest would not therefore leave him: but they that knew him to be the Word of life, and sent of God, did continue with him to the end.—It is a lesse matter, if some did forsake his Apostle, as Phygellus, and Hermogenes, and Philetus, and Hymenæus. Then hee cites that of S. John, They went out from us, but they were not of us, &c.

prodierunt, sed non fuerunt ex nobis, &c. Tertul.

Thus also * Gregory speaking of the holy Ghost saith, that in respect of some vertues he alwayes abides in the hearts of the Saints, but in respect of some hee comes so as to goe away, and goes away so as to come againe. For in respect of Faith, Hope and Charity, and other good things, without which there is no comming to Heaven, as Humility, Chastity, Justice and Mercy, in respect of these hee never forsaketh the hearts of the upright. But in respect of Prophecy, Eloquence, and working of miracles sometimes hee is with the Elect, sometimes hee withdrawes himselfe from them. This testimony of Gregory is also cited by Gratian, who from thence, and other testimonies of the Fathers inferrs thus much, that Charity once had (and it is as true of Faith; for Charity cannot be without it, but doth proceede from it, 1 Tim. 1.5.) cannot be lost. Thus wee have not onely the Scriptures, and Fathers, but also the Canon-law it selfe for us. Those places, which the Marquesse alledgeth to prove that faith may be lost, doe not speake of justifying Faith, whereby one is ingrafted into Christ, and made a member of his Body, but either

qui sunt ejus: & plantam, quam non plantavit: Pater eradicat.—Avolent quantum volent paleæ levis fidei quocunque afflatu tentationum, eo purior massa frumenti in horrea Domini reponetur. Nonne ab ipso Domino quidam discipulum scandalizati diverterunt? Noc tamen propterea ceteri quoque discedendum à vestigiis ejus putaverunt: sed qui scierunt illum vitæ esse verbum, & à Deo venisse, perseveraverunt in comitatu ejus usque ad finem.—Minus est si Apostolum ejus aliqui, Phygellus, & Hermogenes, & Philetus, & Hymenæus reliquerunt.—Ex vobis, inquit, de Prescript. cap. 3.

* In sanctorum quippe cordibus juxta quasdam virtutes semper permanet, juxta quasdam verò recessurus venit, & venturus recedit. In fide etenim, sps, atque charitate, & in bonis aliis, sine quibus ad cælestem patriam non potest venire, sicut est humilitas, castitas, justitia atque misericordia, perfectorum corda non deserit. In prophetiæ verò virtute, doctrinæ faciundia, miraculorum exhibitione, electis suis aliquando adest, aliquando se subtrahit. Greg. hom. 5 in Ezech.

Ex præmissis itaque apparet quòd Charitas semel habita ulteriùs non amittitur. Grat. de penis. dist. 2.

of an outward profession of the Faith, that is, of the Doctrine of Faith, as that *1 Tim. 1. 19.* where the Apostle bids *Timothy hold faith (i.e. the Doctrine of Faith) and a good conscience*; and adds that some having put away a good conscience, concerning Faith did make shipwrack, that is, did forsake the Doctrine of Faith, and fall into Heresie. Such were *Hymenæus* and *Alexander*, whom hee mentioneth *vers. 20.* and saith that he delivered them unto Satan, *that they might learne not to blaspheme.* And that which hee there calleth Faith, hee calleth Truth, *2 Tim. 2. 18.* where speaking of *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, hee saith, *Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the Resurrection is past already.* Hee adds that hereby they did overthrow the Faith of some, that is, they did draw them from the Faith, making them to embrace Heresie. But that these seducers or seduced ones, were ever such believers, as that they were indued with justifying Faith, the Apostle doth not say, neither can it be proved; *Tertullian* was of another minde; as appeares by his words before cited. Yea, so was *S. John*, whose words to this purpose both *Tertullian* and other Fathers (as I have shewed) have made use of, when hee saith, speaking of such as those, *They went out from us, but they were not of us, &c. 1 Joh. 2. 19.* Or they speak of an Historicall Faith, whereby one doth assent unto the truth of the Gospell, and is somewhat affected with it, but it doth not take roote in the heart, as it is said *Mat. 13. 21. yet hath hee not roote in himselfe*: and therefore this is not such a Faith, as wee speake of, when wee say, that Faith cannot be lost, viz. a Faith, whereby Christ is received, and doth dwell in the heart. *Joh. 1. 12. Ephes. 3. 17.* For all that Faith, which is spoken of *Luke 8. 13.* a man is but chaffe still, and not true wheat whatsoever hee seeme either to himselfe or others. They compared to the thorny ground, who for a while believe, are distinguished from such as have a good and honest heart, *Luke 8. 13, 15.* Therefore those temporary believers are no sound and sincere Believers: *their heart is not right with God, and therefore they are not steadfast in his Covenant, Psal. 78. 37.*

The Marquesse adds, *This is frequently affirmed by the Fathers, viz. that Faith may be lost*; but hee cites onely *Austine de grat. & lib. arb. de corrept. & grat. & ad articulos.* Now I have pro-

duced

duced many testimonies of *Austine* to the contrary, as also of diverse other Fathers, who speake very home to our purpose. As for these places of *Austine* alledged against us, the two first are justly to be waved. For onely the bookes are cited, but no Chapters; whereas in the one booke there are 24. and 16. in the other. For the third place, it's true that *Austine* doth oftentimes in answer to the Articles imposed upon him, deny that Gods predestination is the cause of mans non-perseverance, as some did charge him to hold; why any fall away hee, shewes the cause to be in themselves, not in God; that it is not from Gods worke, but from their owne will: that they are not thrust, that they may fall; nor cast out, that they may depart. But that true justifying Faith once had may be lost, hee sayes not any thing that way, but much against it in other places, as before is shewed.

Quod si per generalitatem vocationis, & per abundantiam bonitatis Dei, etiam non

perseveraturi perseveraturis admixti sunt, hi cum à pietate deficiunt, non ex Dei opere, sed ex sua voluntate deficiunt, nec impelluntur ut cadant, nec ejiciuntur ut deserant. Aug. ad art. 16. Similiter etiam ad alios articulos.

In the next place, *Wee hold* (saith the Marquesse) that God *Page 66.*
did never inevitably damne any man before hee was borne, or as you say from all eternity. You say hee did; wee have Scripture for what wee say, Wisd. 1. 13. God made not death, neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living. 1 Tim. 2. 3, 4. God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, 2 Pet. 3. 9. The Lord is not willing that any should die, but that all should come to repentance. And if you will not believe when hee saith so, believe him when hee sweares it, As I live, saith the Lord, I do not delight in the death of a sinner.

Ans. I doe not know any Protestant, who saith that God did damne any man before hee was borne, or from all eternity. For how should that be? damning being taken (as usually it is) for inflicting eternall punishment. For how can a man before hee hath any being, have eternall punishment inflicted upon him? yet * Bernard speaketh of his being *damnat*
tus antequam natus; damned before hee was borne. I suppose hee meant that before he came out of the wombe hee was in the

Secundum exteriorem hominem de parentibus illis venio, qui me ante fecerunt damnatum, quam natum. Bern. meditat. cap. 2.

estate of damnation by reason of the guilt of *Adams* sinne imputed to him, and the corruption of nature inherent in him. How ever this is certaine, that (as * *Bernard* also saith) predestination is before all times, even from all eternity.

* *Prædestinatio non duo ab ex-
ortu Ecclesie*

sed ne à mundi principio quidem principium habuit, non denique à tempore illo, vel illo ; ante tempora est. Ber. in Cant. ser. 78.

*Bell. de grat. &
lib. arbit. lib. 2.
cap. 16.*

*So say the Tran-
slators of the old
Testament at
Doway after
Exodus in, The
continuance of
the Church.*

And *Bellarmino* observes, that though the use of the Schooles hath so prevailed, that they onely are said to be predestinates who are elected unto glory, and so in the Scriptures predestination is not used but in that sense, yet *Austine* doth call reprobation predestination to destruction. Neither is there any question betwixt us, and them of the Church of Rome, but that reprobation as well as election is from all eternity. And therefore as wee doe not say any more then they, that God doth damne any man from eternity; so they as well as wee doe say, that God doth reprobate many from eternity, even as many as hee doth not elect; now the elect are but few in comparison, as our Saviour tells us, saying, *Many are called, but few are chosen. Mat. 22. 14.* But some may, and indeed doe say, *Gods reprobation is not the cause of any mans damnation, but mans own sinne is the proper cause both of reprobation and damnation.* But though this be asserted by some of our adversaries, yet others of that

*Dicimus deinde Reprobationem duos
actus comprehendere, &c. Primum
enim non habet Deus voluntatem
illos salvandi. Deinde habet volun-
tatem eos damnandi: & quidem quod
attinet ad priorem actum, nulla datur
ejus causa ex parte hominum, &c. Bell.
de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 2. cap. 16.*

party will not approve of it. For *Reprobation* (saith *Bellarmino*) doth comprehend two acts, &c. For first God hath not a will of saving them (viz. the Reprobate) And the he hath a will of damning them. And in respect of the former act there is no cause (of *Reprobation*) on mans part. Therefore mans sinne in *Bellarmines* judgement is not the cause

of *Reprobation* in respect of that act. Now if God have not a will to save a man, it is not possible that hee should be saved: and if hee bee not saved, hee must bee being * damned. And therefore from that act of Gods *Reprobation*, which *Bellarmino* confesseth to have no cause on mans part, there inevitable followes mans damnation, though damnation be neither inflicted on man, nor intended to be inflicted on

* *Viz. if ever he
have any being.*

on him but for sinne. Yet *Bellarmino* in that which hee saith, is not so accurate as hee might be; For *non habere voluntatem salvandi*, not to have a will to save a man, or not to will a mans salvation, is properly no act, but rather a negation of an act, and therefore indeed *Bellarmino* calles it *actum negativum* a *Bellar. Ibid.* negative act; but that (as I said) is indeed no act at all, but a meere negation of it. And therefore *Alvarez* maketh the first act of Reprobation to be a positive act, whereby Gods Will is not to admit some unto life eternall. It's one thing not to have a will to save; and another thing to have a will not to save; the former is meerly negative, but the latter is positive. And hee proves that Reprobation doth include a positive act, because the meere negative of not ordaining unto life eternall is even in respect of men and angells that onely may be, but never shall be. Those God doth not will to save, and to glorifie, yet properly they are not the objects of Gods Reprobation.

The same * *Alvarez* saith that this positive act of Reprobation, whereby Gods Will and Pleasure from eternity was, not to admit some into his Kingdome, was not conditionall, but absolute, and in order of nature before the fore-knowledge of the ill use of free-will. And this hee proves from hence, that the Apostle *Rom. 9.* having inferred from what hee had said of Predestination and Reprobation, *Therefore hee hath mercy on*

Reprobatio Dei æterna includit actum positivum, quo voluit quosdam non admittere ad vitam æternam — Deus n. verè non reprobavit homines vel angelos possibiles, qui nunquam erunt; & tamen circa illos se habuit negativè, non ordinando eos ad vitam æternam. Ergo Reprobatio includit actum positivum. *Alvar. de Auxil. lib. 11. disput. 109. num. 5.*

* Actus positivus, quo Deus ab æterno voluit non admittere quosdam in suum regnum, non fuit conditionatus, sed absolutus;

antecedens in signo rationis præscientiam mali usus liberi arbitrii, &c. — Probatur conclusio; nam Apostolus ad *Rom. 9.* postquam intulit ex his, quæ dixerat in eodem cap. de prædestinatione & Reprobatione, Ergo cujus vult miseretur, & quem vult indurat; statim proponit eorum querimoniam, quibus dura videtur Prædestinatio, & Reprobatio, antecedens præscientiam meritorum, & ait, Quid adhuc queritur? voluntati enim ejus quis resistit? Et huic objectioni occurrit subdicens, O homo tu quis es, &c. Annon habet potestatem figulus, &c. Hæc autem responsio & objurgatio non haberet locum, si Deus antecederet ad præscientiam mali usus liberi arbitrii neminem reprobareret absolutè & efficaci voluntate. Posset enim facillè respondere Apost. quod ex bono, vel malo usu liberi arbitrii creati, præcognito à Deo tanquam ex conditione sine quâ non, dependet quod providentia supernaturalis Dei circa unum habet formaliter rationem Reprobationis, & non circa alium. *Alvar. disput. 109. num. 6.*

whom

whom hee will have mercy, and whom hee will, hee hardeneth, presently brings in the complaint of those, who thinke it hard, that God should predestinate, and reprobate without having respect to merits, *Why then doth hee yet complaine ? for who hath resisted his Will ? And hee answers, O man who art thou that repleiest against God ? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made mee thus ? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessell unto honour, and another unto dishonour ?* Now this answer and reproofe (saith hee) should have no place, if God did not before the fore-knowledge of the ill use of Free-will reprobate some by an absolute and efficacious will. For the Apostle might easily answer, that it depends upon the good or ill use of mans free-will, which God did fore-know, that some are reprobated, and not others. And hee cites * *Austine saying,*

* Multi salvi non sunt, non quia ipsi nolunt, sed quia Deus non vult; quod absque ullâ caligine monstratur in parvulis. *Aug. Epist. 107. citat. ab Alvar Ibid.*

Many are not saved, not because they will not, but because God will not, which most clearly appears in young infants.

† Reprobatio, quâ Deus statuit non dare aliquibus vitam æternam, & permittere peccatū eorum, non est conditionata, sed absoluta, nec præsupponit in Deo præscientiam, vel prævisionem demeritorum ipsius reprobi, aut perseverantiæ in peccato usque ad ultimum vitæ. *Alvar. diss. 110. num. 8.*

This same Author also againe layes down this conclusion, † *Reprobation, whereby God determines, not to give eternal life to some, and to suffer them to sinne, is not conditionall, but absolute; neither doth it presuppose in God the fore-knowledge, or fore-sight of the ill deserts of the Reprobate, or of his perseverance in sinne unto the end of his life.*

* Neque peccatum actuale, neque originale, neque utrumque simul prævisum à Deo, fuit de facto causa meritoria, vel motiva Reprobationis aliqujus, quantum ad omnes illius effectus. *Alv. ib. n. 11.*

* And againe, *Neither actual sinne, nor originall, nor both together, fore-seene of God, were the meritorious cause, or motive of any ones Reprobation, in respect of all the effects of it.*

† Existimo S. Thomam resolutorie eandem docuisse sententiam.

et enim *art. 3.* Sicut prædestinatio includit voluntatem conferendi gratiam & gloriam, ita Reprobatio includit voluntatem permitendi aliquem cadere in culpam, & ferendi damnationis poenam pro culpâ. *Alvar. Ibid.*

† And hee takes *Aquinas* to be resolute in this point, and hee cites him, saying, *As predestination doth include a will to conferre grace, and glory, so Reprobation doth include a will to suffer one to fall into sinne, and to inflict the punishment of damnation for sinne.*

Hence

Hence *Alvarez* inferres, that according to *Aquinas* the permission of the first sinne for which a Reprobate is damned, is the effect of Reprobation. And hee addes that of this permission there is no cause in the Reprobate. Because before the permission of the first sinne, and before the first sinne, there is no other sinne; for if there were, then it were not simply the first sinne; or man should commit some other sinne before, which God did not permit, whereas no sinne can be committed but by Gods permission. He cites also *Aquinas* againe speaking thus, *why God doth chuse some to glory, and reprobate others, there is no reason but onely Gods Will.* And having cited that of the Apostle *Rom. 9. The children being not yet borne, neither having done any good, or evill, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of Workes, but of him that calleth, it was said unto her, The elder should serve the younger, As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated;* having cited this (I say) hee addes that the Apostle here (both *Austine* and *Aquinas* avouching as much) plainly signifies, that in the absolute Election and Reprobation of Men, God did not looke at Mens merits, or demerits, but of his own pleasure did chuse, and predestinate one to glory, and not predestinate another, but by an absolute Will did determine to suffer him to sinne, and to be hardened, or to persevere in sinne to the end of his life, and to inflict eternall punishment upon him for sin.

Hee brings in also *Austine* confuting those, who say, that *Esau* and *Jacob* being not yet borne, God did therefore hate the one, and love the other, because hee did foresee the workes that they would doe. *Who* (said *Austine*) can but wonder, that the

Ergo secundum *S. Thomam* permissio primi peccati, propter quod reprobis damnatur, est effectus Reprobationis: sed illius permissionis nulla datur causa ex parte reprobis: nam ante permissionem primi peccati, & ante primum peccatum non datur aliud peccatum præcedens: aliàs illud non esset simpliciter primum, vel in homine præcederet aliud peccatum commissum, Deo non permitte, &c. *Alvar. Ibib.*

Quare hos eligat ad gloriam, & illos reprobet, non habet rationem nisi divinam, voluntatem. *Aquin. apud Alvar. Ibib.*

In quo testimonio, ut disp. 37. num. 9. ex doctrinâ *S. Augustini*, & *S. Thomæ* ostendimus, aperte significatur in electione absolutâ, & reprobatione hominum Deum non respexisse ad merita, vel demerita præviâ, sed pro suo beneplacito istum elegisse, & prædestinasse ad gloriam, illum non prædestinasse, sed voluntate absolutâ statuisse permittere peccatum illius, & obdurationem, sive perseverantiam in eodem peccato usque ad ultimum vitæ, & penam æternam infligere propter idem peccatum. &c. *Ibid. num. 12.*

Ideo, inquit, nondum natorum aliû oderat, aliû diligebat, quia eorum futura opera providebat. Quis istum acutissimum sensum defuisse Apostolo non miretur? Hoc quippe ille non vidit. &c. *Aug. Epist. 105. apud Alvar. Ibid. num. 13.*

Apostle should not finde out this acute reason; for hee did not see it, &c. No, but flies to this, hee saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, &c. So then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.

Alon. de Aul. l. 1. disp. 5.

And that none of our Romish adversaries may sleight *Austine* in this point, *Alvarez* about the beginning of his Worke hath a Disputation to shew what authority this Fathers judgement is of in the point of Grace, and Predestination. Hee shewes that not onely *Prosper*, but also many Bishops of *Rome* did approve of *Austines* Doctrine concerning these points, and did determine it to be sound and good.

Nec solus Prosper, sed plures etiam summi Pontifices Doctrinam ejusdem Augustini approbaverunt, & Catholicam esse decreverunt. Alvar. Ibid. num. 3.

And therefore in the testimony of *Austine*, wee have many testimonies, and such as are

irrefragable with those, with whom now wee have to doe. But let us heare what some other late Writers of the Church of *Rome* doe say as to this point concerning Reprobation. *God from eternity* (saith Cardinal ** Cajetan*) *doth truly chuse some, and reprobate others, doth love some, and hate others, in that from eternity his will is to vouchsafe some the helps of his grace, whereby to bring them to eternall glory; and from eternity also his will is to leave some to themselves, and not to afford them that gracious help, which he hath decreed to afford the Elect. And this is for God to hate, and to reprobate them; with which yet it doth well stand, that none is damned but by his owne Workes, because neither the Sentence, nor Execution of damnation is before that such Reprobates doe sinne.*

** Deus ab æterno verè quosdam eligit, & quosdam reprobat, quosdam diligit & quosdam odio habet, pro quâto quibusdam ab æterno vult conferre opem gratiæ suæ, & adjuvare illos*

usque ad gloriam æternam; quosdam autem ab æterno quoque vult permitttere sibi ipsis, nec adjuvare eos gratuito auxilio, quod electis decrevit conferre. Et hoc est Deum illos odio habere, hoc est Deum illos reprobare non ex operibus. Cum quotamen stat quodd nullus damnatur nisi ex propriis opibus, nec sententia siquidem, nec executio damnationis sit antequam hujusmodi reprobi peccent. Cajet. in Rom. 9. 13.

** Jam hinc colligendum relinquit Apo-*

So also + Estius saith that the Apostle Rom. 9. doth teach, that neither mens Election nor their Reprobation is from the Merits of
solus argumento à figurâ ad rem significaram, neque electionem hominû, neque Reprobationem esse ex ullis operum meritis, sed Deum ex solo voluntatis arbitrio alios eligere, alios autem reprobare. Est. ad Rom. 9. 13.

Workes.

works, but that God by the mere pleasure of his will doth chuse some, and Reprobates others.

And againe upon those words, *O man, who art thou that repliest against God*, &c. hee saith that the Apostles intent was to answer not so much the objection, as the cause of objecting. And that therefore he answers concerning the Will of God Electing, and Reprobating, and denies that the reason of it is to be inquired by man, who is Gods creature, and made by him: yet that by the example of a potter the Apostle shewes, that God doth this out of the liberty of his Will without any other reason. And he addes that *Thomas Aquinas* did also thus rightly expound the words of the Apostle.

Quid adhuc queritur, &c. Respondet itaque de voluntate Dei diligente, & reprobante, negans ejus rationem ab homine, qui creatura, & sumentum Dei est, scrutandam esse, imò ab exemplo figuli ostendens Deum hoc facere pro libertate suae voluntatis absque aliâ ratione, ut rectè locum hunc *Thomas* exposuit. Est. ad Rom. 9. 20.

* *Bradwardine*, who intituled the book which hee wrote, of the cause of God, is not to be omitted; Hee saith, *It's true, God doth not eternally punish any without his fault going before temporally, and abiding eternally: yet God did not eternally reprobate any, because of sinne, as a cause antecedently moving Gods Will.* What doe our Divines say, even such as are of the more rigid sort, as concerning this high and abstruse point of Reprobation, what (I say) doe they say more then is said by these great and eminent Doctours of the Church of Rome, and before them by *Austine*, and before both him and them (as both hee and they conceived) by the Apostle *Paul* himselfe? *The Decree of Reprobation* (saith Bishop *Deaneau*) is not thin to be conceived, *I will damne Judas, whether he believe, or not believe, repent or not repent: for this were contrary to the truth of the Evangelical promises: but thus, I am absolutely determined not to give unto Judas that speciall grace, which would cause him to believe, and repent: and I am absolutely purposed to permit him to incurr his own damnation by his voluntary obstinacy, and small impenitency.* And againe, *It must here be observed, that Reprobation is not a nihil ponere in reprobato (that is) That internall reprob-*

Studium fuit. A postoli non tam ad directionem respondere, quam ad causam obijciendi. Concluserat enim, Ergo casus vult, miseretur, &c. unde nata erat illa objectio,

* Verum est, quodd Deus aeternaliter nullum punire sine culpa sua temporaliter praecedente, & aeternaliter permanente; non tamen propter culpam, tanquam propter causam antecedenter moventem voluntatem divinam, Deus quoniam aeternaliter reprobavit. *Bradward. de Caus. Dei lib. 1. cap. ult.*

B. Deaneau, Animadvers. p. 352.

Ibid. pag. 356.

bation doth put nothing in the person that is reprobated) It putteth onely in God a firme Decree of permitting such persons to fall into small sinne, and for it a firme decree of condemning them unto eternall punishment. So both hee and diverse other of our English Divines that were at the Synod of Dort, being sent thither by King James, as they hold that * Reprobation, which is the denying of election, doth put in God an immutable will not to have mercy on such a person as is passed by, in respect of giving eternall life. And that foreseene unbeliefe is not the cause of non election. So withall they lay down this position, God doth damne none, nor appoint unto Damnation, but in respect of sinne. So Doctor Ames saith that it is too great a slander to say that according to our opinion God did immediately decree mens damnation, whether they be sinners, or no. Our opinion (saith hee) is this, that God did not choose some (as he did chuse others) but did determine to let them abide in their sinnes, and for those sinnes to suffer the punishment of just damnation; and that of this decree there is no cause to be found in those that are not elected, which is not as much to be found in those that are elected.

* Reprobatio, quæ est electionis negatio, ponit immutabilem Dei voluntatem de non misericordie talis personæ præteritæ, quoad ipsam donationem vitæ æternæ. Suffr. Britan. in 1. artic.

Prævisam infidelitatem esse causam non electionis falsum est. Ibid.

Deus neminem damnat, aut damnationi destinat, nisi ex consideratione peccati. Ibid. Theſ. 5. † Cur simplex appellent hoc decretum, non intelligimus, nisi velint Deum, (ex nostrâ sententiâ) immediate decrevisse damnationem hominum, sive peccatores fuerint, sive non; quod est nimis simpliciter calumniari. Ames. Animad. de Prædest. cap. 11. Sect. 6. Nostra sententiâ est, Deum quosdam homines non elevisse, (sicut alios elegit) sed decrevisse permittere, ut in peccatis suis manerent, & propter illa peccata justæ damnationis pœnam subirent huiusmodi decreti nullam causam in non electis reperiri, quæ non similiter in electis reperitur. Ames. Ibid.

Dicimus, & verè, destinatos esse damnationi non paucos antequam nascantur. — Veruntamen non dicimus quenguam ad mortem subeundam destinatum esse nisi propter peccatum, nec ullo momento dicimus destinacionem ipsam quoad actum destinantis præcedere prævisionem peccati. D. Twiss. de Scienc. med. lib. 1. digress. 5.

Thus also Doctor Twisse, We say, and say truly (saith hee) that many are appointed unto damnation before they are borne. — Yet we doe not say, that any is appointed to suffer death but for sinne, nor that the decree is selfe in respect of the act of him that decreeth, doth any one moment goe before the foresight of sinne. I see nothing in these Assertions of our Divines, that hath any thing more horrid in it, then that is, which they of the Church of Rome before cited, doe assert; and yet some of these goe as high in the point of Pre-

Predestination (I thinke) as any others. *a* Calvin himselfe, as hee saith, *If wee cannot give a reason why God hath mercy on his own, but because so it pleaseth him: neither have we any cause why others are Reprobated, but his Will.* *b* So he saith withall, *If all by their condition be subject to condemnation, how can they, whom God doth predestinate unto destruction, complaine that he doth deale unjustly with them? Let all the sonnes of Adam come, let them contend and dispute with their Creator, because by his eternall providence, before they were borne, they were appointed to eternall misery. What will they be able to object against this plea, when God shall on the other side call them to a review of themselves? If all be taken out of the corrupt Masse, it is no wonder if they be subject to damnation. Let them not therefore accuse God of iniquity, if by his Eternall judgement they be appointed unto death, to which, whether they will or no, themselves doe see that they are led by their own nature of its own accord.* *c* And againe, *Although by Gods eternall Providence man is cast into that calamity, which doth befall him, yet he takes the matter of it from himselfe, and not from God, seeing for no other reason is he so undone, but because he did degenerate from that purity wherein God created him, and made himselfe vicious, impure and perverse.* *d* And againe, *we affirme that none do perish but by their own desert.* *e* And againe, *The cause of our damnation is in our selves.* Thus Calvin being heard speake for himselfe, it plainly appeares that hee by the decree of Reprobation makes God the author of mans damnation no otherwise then diverse Romanists themselves doe.

æternâ illius providentiâ, ante suam generationem, perpetuæ calamitati addicti fuerint; quid obstitere adversus defensionem poterunt, ubi Deus illos ad sui recognitionem contra vocabit? Ex corruptâ massâ si desumpti sunt omnes, non mirum si damnationi subjacent. Ne ergo Deum iniquitatis insimulent, si æterno ejus judicio morti destinati sint, ad quam à suâ ipsorum naturâ sponte se perducere, velint nolint, ipsi sentiant. *Calvin. Instit. lib. 3. cap. 23. Sect. 3.*

c Tamen si æternâ Dei providentiâ necam, cui subiacet, calamitatem condidit est homo; à seipso tamen ejus materiam, non à Deo sumpsit, quando nullâ aliâ ratione sic perditus est, nisi quia à purâ Dei creatione in vitiosam & impuram perversitatem degeneravit. *Calv. Instit. lib. 3. cap. 23. Sect. 9. & Sect. 12.*

d Asserimus nullos perire immerentes. *Et de eter. Dei Prædest. pag. 976.* Damnationis nostræ culpa in nobis residet.

a Ergo si non possumus rationem assignare cur suos misericordiâ dignetur, nisi quoniam ita illi placet: neque etiam in aliis reprobandis aliud habebimus quàm ejus voluntatem. *Calv. Instit. lib. 3. c. 23. Sect. 11.*

b Quod si iudicio mortis obnoxii sunt omnes naturali conditione, quos ad mortem Dominus prædestinat, eequâ, obsecro, ejus iniquitate erga se conquerantur? Veniant omnes filii Adam, cum suo creatore contendant, ac discerpant, quod

* Ceterum hæc summa est responsio Pauli, Quamvis Deus absque ullo qualitarum respectu, amori destinet, & odio destinet, quoscunque ipsi libuit, tamen procul cum abesse ab omni iniustitia, quoniam inter æternum Dei decretum, & ejus decreti executionem

And thus also Beza, * *This (saith hee) is the sum of Pauls answer, although God appoint either to love, or to hatred whom he will, without any respect of their qualifications, yet he is free from all injustice, because betwixt Gods eternall decree, and the execution of it, there are subordinate causes, whereby God doth bring the elect unto salvation, and doth justly damne the Reprobate. For he saves the elect by mercy, and damnes the Reprobate by indignation; so that they doe most foolishly, who confounded the decree of Reprobation with damnation, seeing that the cause of damnation is manifest, to wit. sinne, but the Will of God is the onely cause of Reprobation. Therefore God doth wrong to neither, because both deserve destruction. For mercy shewes that the Elect were miserable, and therefore worthy because of sinne to be destroyed; and indignation presupposeth perversnesse, in which the Reprobate are justly hardened.* The like he hath also againe a little after.

sunt causæ subordinatæ, quibus electos ad salutem adducit, & reprobos justè damnat. Electos n. servat per misericordiam, reprobos damnat per indignationem, ut prorsus ineptè faciant, qui Reprobationis decretum cum damnatione confundunt; quum hujus causa manifesta sit, nempe peccatum, illius verò sola Dei voluntas. Neutris igitur facti injuriam, quoniam utrique digni sunt exitio. Misericordia enim miseros electos fuisse ostendit, ac proinde dignos, qui propter peccatum perderentur; indignatio verò perversitatem præsupponit, in qua justè indurantur reprobi. Beza ad Rom. 9. 15. Similia etiam habet ad v. 17.

* Qui massæ nomine humani generis corruptum intelligunt, mihi non satisfaciunt in hujus loci explicatione. Primum enim mihi videtur nomen illud informis materis, ne condito quidem humano generi, ne sum jam corrupto, satis convenire. Deinde si genus humanum ut corruptum confiteretur Apostolus, non dixisset quedam vasa ad decus, quedam ad dedecus facta; sed potius quum omnia vasa ad dedecus esset comparata, aliâ in illo dedecore relicta, alia verò ab hoc dedecore ad decus transfata. Postremo nisi Paulus ad ultimum usque gradum confunderet, non satisfecit objectæ questioni. Semper enim quaeritur, ista corruptio temerène evenerit, an verò secundum Dei propositum, ac proinde difficultas eadem recurrat. Dico igitur Paulum elegantissimâ istâ similitudine adhibere ad ipsum Adami creationem alludere, & æternum ut ne propositum Dei confondere, qui antequam humanum genus conderet, jam tum & in quibusdam, quos novit per misericordiam servandis, & in quibusdam, quos etiam novit; justo judicio perdendis, gloriam suam illustrare, pro suo jure, & merâ voluntate decreverit. Beza ad Rom. 3. 21.

And whereas * Beza saith that they doe not satisfie him, who by the lump which the Apostle speakes of Rom. 9. 17 doe understand mankind being corrupt; because. 1. That terme he thinkes doth not well agree to man being created, much lesse to him being already corrupted. And againe, if the Apostle had

some Vessells were made unto honour, and some unto dishonour; but seeing all Vessells were fitted for dishonour (all mankind being corrupted) the Apostle would rather have said that some were left in that dishonour, and some translated from it unto honour. Finally, except Paul goe up to the highest step, the objection (hee thinkes) is not satisfied. For that still it will be demanded; whether that corruption came as it happened, or according to Gods purpose; and so the same difficulty will remaine still. Therefore Paul (hee saith) by that most elegant similitude did allude unto Adams Creation, and did ascend up even to Gods eternall purpose, who before he did create mankind, did of his meere will and pleasure determine to shew forth his glory in saving some through his mercy, and in destroying some by his just judgement.

This is no more then * *Estius* on *Rom. 9.* doth subscribe unto. In this dispute (saith hee) the Apostle doth not suppose the lump corrupt, although that which the Apostle saith is true also of it according to Aulines opinion. For the Scriptures often using the comparison of a lump, which the Potter doth fasten as he pleaseth, speaks of the lump absolutely, not supposing any fault in it, but only considering the nature of it, whereby it is fit to be fastned into any worke of the Potter. And therefore the Apostle doth not say, that the Potter of the same lump doth make one Vessell unto honour, and leave another in dishonour: but that of the same lump he doth make unto dishonour. Neither doth he say, that the thing formed doth not say to him that formed it, *Why hast thou left me in the corrupt lump?* but, *Why hast thou made me so?* that is, a dishonorable, and reprobate vessell.

luto loquitur absolute, nullum ejus vitium supponens, sed solum ejus naturam considerans, quâ formabile est ad omne opus figulinum. Unde nec ait Apostolus figulum ex eadem massâ aliud vas facere in honorem, aliud in ignominia relinquere, sed ex eadem massâ facere in ignominiam. Neque dixit, figmentum ei qui se finxit non dicere, Cur me reliquisti in massâ corruptâ? Sed, Cur me fecisti sic? id est, vas ignominiosum, & reprobum. *Estius* ad *Rom. 9. 21.*

* Non igitur in hac disputatione supponit Apostolus massam corruptam, licet etiam de ea secundum Augustini sententiam, habet veritatem Apostoli sententia. Nam Scriptura passim adhibens comparationem luti, quod pro suo libitu formatur figulus, de

Here wee see *Estius* both approves of *Bezaes* interpretation, and also makes use of his reason for the confirming of it. And hee addes that the Apostle in that similitude of a lump, and

Nec verum est, *Paulum* ad locum *Jeremiae* (*Jer.* 18. 6.) alludere, quin potius manifesta est allusio ad *Isai.* 45. Væ qui contradicite fictori suo, &c. Numquid dicit lutum, &c. Quæ sanè verba significant ita Deum pro merito suo beneplacito statuere de rebus humanis in utramlibet partem, quomodo figulus ex luto facit opus quodcunque voluerit. Quo etiam pertinet quod sequitur, Væ qui dicit, &c. Quod enim meritum hominis, ut parentes eum talem, vel tamen gignant? *Esai.* 1. *Ibid.*

and a Potter doth not allude to *Jer.* 18. 6, but that rather there is a manifest allusion to *Isai.* 45. 9. *Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker : Let the potsherd strive with the potshards of the Earth : shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou ? or thy worke, he hath no hands ?* Which words (hee saith) doe verily signifie thus much, that God of his meere pleasure doth so determine of mens estate either the one way, or the other, as a Potter doth make of clay what worke hee pleaseth. And hither-

to (hee saith) doth that belong, which followeth (*Isai.* 45. 10.) *Woe unto him that saith unto his Father, What begetteth thou ? or to the woman, What hast thou brought forth ? For (saith hee) what hath man deserved, why his parents should ingender him such, or such ?* And a little before by diverse arguments he confutes those, who think that the Apostle speaking of † Reprobation doth suppose the lump of mankind infected with originall sinne. If (saith he) *those things, which the Apostle delivers in this Chapter, be diligently considered, it will fully appeare, that as well Reprobation as Election is absolutely not of foreseene merits. For 1. When he saith, neither having done any good, or evill, he excludes as well the evill action of Esau, as the good action of Jacob, and consequently as well the ill merit of Reprobation, as the good merit of Election. 2. To that question, Is there unrighteousnesse with God ? he doth not answer, that therefore there is not, because the*

† De Reprobatione non perinde omnes consentiunt. Quidam enim dicunt Apostolum supponere massam humani generis infectam peccato originali, &c.

Verum si diligenter expendantur ea, quæ hoc cap. habet Apost. prorsus apparebit, tam Reprobationem; quam electionem absolute non ex ullis esse prævisis meritis. Nam, 1. cum dicit, Cum nihil egissent aut boni, aut mali, tam excludit actionem malam *Esau*, quam actionem bonam *Jacob*; & consequenter tam malum merium Reprobationis, quam bonum meritum electionis. 2. Quæstioni isti, Numquid iniquitas, &c. non respondet, ideo non esse, quia tota massa peccato vitiatæ est, &c. sed ita respondet, ut tam horum Reprobationem, quam illorum electionem referat in solam Dei voluntatem, eo tandem dicto cuiusolum interrogatorem compescens, O homo tu quis, &c. 3. Comparatio illa de figuræ eadem massa, &c. malæ corruptæ hypothese excludit. Hic enim professio nihil in massa supponitur, nisi quod sit indifferens, & formabilis ad utrumque.—In hanc sententiam, &c. Lamb. Hugo. Vid. S. Thom. Cajetan. Lyran. Tileman. Perer. &c. *Esai.* ad

cap. 9. v. 13. *For the clay is in the Potter's hand, and he shall do with it as he listeth.*

Arch

111

whole

whole lump is depraved by sinne, &c. but he answers so, as that he refers as well the Reprobation of these, as the election of those, unto the sole Will of God, and so repulses the curious inquirer. O man, who art thou, &c. 3. That comparison of a Potter of the same lump making one vessell unto honour, and another unto dishonour, doth exclude the supposition of a corrupt lump. For here verily is nothing supposed in the lump, but that it is indifferent, and may be fashioned both the one way, and the other.

Thus this learned Papist goes as farre in the point both of Election and of Reprobation as any Protestant (that I know) whatsoever. Neither would he have us thinke that he goes alone; for hee cites many, as Lombard, Hugo de S. Victore, Aquinas, Cajetan, Lyra, Tittleman, and Pererius, as being of the same opinion with him, and interpreting the words of the Apostle in the same manner. And this (I suppose) may suffice to vindicate the Doctrine of Protestants (even such as goe highest in this point) as touching Reprobation.

Now for the Scriptures objected against us, the first, viz. *Wis. 1. 13.* is not Canonically. Hierome brandes that booke called *the Wisdome of Solomon*, as falsely intituled; and saith, that it is no where to be found among the Hebrewes (to whom the Oracles of God were committed, *Rom. 3. 2.*) and that the style doth smell of Greeke eloquence; and that some ancient writers affirme it to be the worke of Philo a Jew. Therefore (saith he) as the Church doth read indeed the Bookes of Judith, Tobie and the Maccabees, but doth not receive them amongst the Canonically Scriptures: so also doth it receive these two volumes (viz. Ecclesiasticus, and the wisdom of Solomon) for the edifying of the people, but not for the confirming of Ecclesiasticall Doctrines.

But suppose it were Canonically, the place alledged is answered to our hand by one of the Roman Church, viz. *Alvarez*: when it is said, *God made not death*, the meaning (hee saith) is, that God doth not primarily of it selfe intend the

Fertur, &c. Et alius Pseudepigraphus, qui Sapientia Solomonis inscribitur.— Apud Hebræos nusquam est: quin & ipse stylus Græcam eloquentiam re-doler, & nonnulli Scriptorum veterum hunc esse Judæi Philonis affirmant, Sicut ergo Judith, & Tobie, & Maccabæorum libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed eos inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipit: sic & hæc duo volumina (Ecclesiasticus, & Librum Sapientie) legit ad ædificationem plebis, non ad authoritatem Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam. *Hier. præf. in Prov.* Sed non solum ratio, sed etiam sensus hujus loci est, quod Deus non intendit per se primum mortem alicujus, sed ratione alterius majoris boni conjuncti. Secundò explicatur locus iste de morte, quantum ad ejus causam, scilicet peccatum, &c.

H h

death

death of any but in respect of some other great good that is joynd with it. And againe that place (hee saith) is expounded of death in respect of the cause, to wit, sinne. These expositions of the place doe free the Doctrine of Protestants from suffering any prejudice by it, were the authority of it greater then indeed it is. The next place is that, 1 Tim. 2. 4. *Who will have all men to be saved, &c.* *Austine* gives diverse interpretations of those words, First, thus, that the meaning is, that God will have all to be saved that are saved, and that none but such as hee will save, can bee saved. Secondly, this that by *all men* are meant men of all sorts, how ever distinguished, Kings and private persons, noble and ignoble, &c. This hee shewes to be agreeable both to the Context, and also to the phrase of Scrip-

Debemus ita intelligere, &c. tanquam diceretur, Nullum hominem fieri saluum, nisi quem saluum fieri ipse voluerit, &c. Aut certe sic dictum est &c. ut omnes homines omne genus hominum intelligamus per quoscunque differentias distributum, reges, priuatos, nobiles, ignobiles, &c. *Enchir.* cap. 103.

Aluar. de Auxil.
dipt. 33.

Deus vult omnes saluos fieri, &c. Sic explicat. *Sed in deo vult omnes saluos fieri, &c.*

* Qui omnes homines vult saluos fieri, hoc vult & facit pios homines velle seu desiderare omnium salutem. Quamvis Deus non velit omnes saluos fieri, sed solos electos, vult tamen omnes saluos fieri, scilicet per nos, & quantum in nobis est, dum percipit ut omnium salutem queramus, & hoc ipsum studium in nobis operatur. Hanc expositionem prae ceteris am-

ture, *Luke 11. 42. You sithe Mint, and Rue, and every Herbe, &c.*

every kinde of Herbe. This latter exposition of the Apostles words *Aluar.* saith is also followed by *Fulgensius*, *Beda*, and *Anselme*. The same *Aluar.* relates two other interpretations, which *Austine* gives of these words, viz. first this, God will have all men to

be saved, that is, hee makes men to will, or desire that all may be saved, as the Spirit is said to make intercession for us, *Rom. 8. 26.* that is, makes us to make intercession or supplication &c.

* *Esse* upon the place doth embrace this Exposition before any other. *Who will have all men to be saved* that is (saith hee) *He willeth, and maketh godly men to desire the salvation of all.* Though God will not save all, but only the elect, yet he will have all to be saved, to wit, by us, as much as in us lies, in that he commands us to seek the salvation of all, and this desire and intention he worketh in us. The Exposition next embraces rather than any of the rest.

The other Exposition which *showeth* volentes, is, that the Apostle speaks of Gods antecedent will. Thus (he saith) *in* *his* *doctr* *expound* *it* *in* *diverse* *places*, and for this Exposition hee also cites *Damascent*, *Propper*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, *Aquinas*, as also *Chrysostome* and *Andros*, and saith that it is common among the Doctors. Now in the next Disputation hee tells us that Gods antecedent Will is that, which respects the object simply considered, and by it selfe: and that this will is called antecedent, not because it goes before the good, or ill use of our will, as some thinke, but because it goes before that will, whereby God respects the object considered with some adjunct, which is the consequent, and latter consideration of it. If (saith hee) the salvation of the Reprobate be considered simply by it selfe, so God doth will it: but if it be considered, as it hath adjoynd the privation, or want of a greater good, to wit, the universall good of manifesting Gods Justice in the Reprobate, and of causing his Mercy the more to shine forth in the Elect, so God doth not will it. And in this respect were affirmed, that God by a consequent Will doth not will that all shall be saved, but only such as are predestinate.

quod absolute consideratum, & secundum se; dicitur autem hæc voluntas antecedens, non quia antecedit bonum, vel malum usum nostri arbitrii, ut arbitrantur auctores prius sententiae, sed quia antecedit voluntatem quâ Deus fertur in objectum consideratum cum aliquo adjuncto, quæ est consequens, & posterior consideratio ejus.—Si consideretur salus reprobatorum secundum se, & absolute, sic est à Deo volita: si autem consideretur, secundum quod habet adjunctum privationem, aut carentiam majoris boni, ut, boni universi manifestationis justitiæ divini in reprobis, & majoris splendoris misericordiæ ejus in electis, sic non est volita à Deo. Et secundum hoc asserimus, quod voluntate consequente Deus non vult omnes salvos fieri, sed solum predestinatos. *Anar. de Ancl. Dissp. 3. cap. 3.*

Now take any of all these four Explications of the Apostles words, wherein hee saith, that God will have all men to be saved (as for my part I like best either the second, or the last) take any of them, I say, and the Apostles words are nothing against that which Protestants hold concerning Reprobation. As for that of Peter, that God is not willing that any should perish, & Pet. 3. 9. *Bellevin* himselfe expounds both it, and the former place, viz. 1 *Tim.* 4. of that Will of God, which Divines call Gods Antecedent will. Now what, that Antecedent

* Quarta explicatio docet loqui Apostolum de voluntate Dei antecedente, quæ est voluntas signi, & voluntas secundum quid, ut dicitur dispo. sequenti. Hanc explicationem etiam tradidit S. Augustinus lib. 22. ad act. ubi falso impositos, act. 2. & cap. 1. de corrupt. & grat. & dicitur. ubi signa. Voluntas Dei antecedens est, quæ fertur in objectum ali-

Verum est, Deum velle omnes salvos fieri voluntate illâ, quam rectè Theologi antecedentem vocant. Bellid. grat. & lib. arb. lib. 2. cap. 3.

Multi salvi
non fiunt,
non quia ipsi
nolint, sed
quia Deus
non vult;
quod absque

ulla contro-
versia manifestatur in parvulis. *Aug. apud Alvar. disput. 34. num. 5.* Ergo conditio, quæ in-
cluditur, in voluntate antecedente, quæ Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri, non est ista,
si ipsi voluerint, aut per eos non flecterit. *Alvar. Ibid.*

Verissimum est, non fieri omnes sal-
vos quia ipsi nolunt: nam si vellent,
Deus eis utique non deesset. Cæterum
nemo vult salvus fieri, nisi Deus præ-
veniendo, & preparando voluntatem
faciat eum velle: cur autem Deus non
faciat omnes velle, quis novit (sensum
Domini? & quis consiliarius ejus
fuit? *Bell loco proxime citato.*

Inrelligitur de morte spiritali, quæ est per peccatum. Hanc enim non vult Deus sed solum permittit. Colligitur hæc explicatio ex contextu : ait enim, scil. de damnati ferre, nisi supp

Will of God is we have seen even now out of *Alvarez* : if *Bellarmino* did understand it otherwise (as *Alvarez* notes that some did) hee is confuted by *Alvarez* in the place above cited. Where hee also cites *Austine* saying, *Many are not saved, not because they will not, but because God will not* : which without all controversy is manifested in young children : whence he inferrs that *the condition, which is included in Gods Antecedent will, whereby he will have all men to be saved, is not this, if they will, and if they do not hinder it.*

non fieri omnes sal-
vatur: nam si vellent,
non desset. Ceterum
s fieri, nisi Deus præ-
parando voluntatem:
cur autem Deus non
le, quis novit (sensum
quis consiliarius ejus
simè citato.

And Bellarmine himselfe also, though he
say, *It is most true, that all are not saved,*
because they will not: for if they would, God
would not be wanting unto them. Yet im-
mediately hee addes, *But none can have a*
will to be saved, except God by preventing and
preparing the will, make him to will it. And
why God doth not make all to will this, who
hath knowne the mind of the Lord? and who
hath been his Counsellour? (Rom. 11. 34.) The last place of
Scripture, which the Marquesse objecteth, is Ezech. 33. 11. *As*
I live, saith the Lord, I delight not in the death of a sinner.

Now to this also we have *Alvarez* to answer for us, *viz.* first that it is meant of spirituall death, which is by sinne. Which God doth only permit, but doth not delight in it. And this Explication hee saith, is confirmed by the words following, *but rather that he be converted, and live.* And if it be expounded of the second death, which is eternall damnation, the meaning; hee saith, is, that God will not inflict this upon any but for sinne.

But

But though God will not inflict damnation upon the Reprobate, but for sinne; yet this same *Alvarez* (as I have shewed abundantly before) and so other Writers of the Church of *Rome* doe tell us, that God by his eternall Decree of Reprobation of his meere Will, and Pleasure, doth determine to suffer the Reprobate to sinne, and so to damne them for it. And thus now I have made it appeare (I hope) sufficiently, that by the consent of the Romanists themselves the Scriptures alledged are not repugnant to the Doctrine of Protestants concerning Reprobation: neither (I thinke) will the Fathers, whom the Marquesse citeth, be against it. The first of them is *Austine*, who (as hath before been shewed) is as much for us as we neede desire. He is here produced against us, but so as that I know not easily how to finde what he saith. For onely *li. 1. de Civit. Dei* is cited, but no Chapter, whereas there are no lesse then 36. in that booke: this is a strange kinde of citing Authors, but the fault may be in the Printer, or in some other, and not in the Marquesse. As for *Cyprian*, who is next cited, I see not any

thing in the place pointed at, which is to this purpose, except this, *Seeing it is written, God made not death, nor doth he rejoyce in the destruction of the living. surely he that would not have any to perish, desires that sinners may come to Repentance, and that by Repentance they may returne unto life againe.*

Now that which *Cyprian* here alledgeth, viz. *God made not death*, &c. I have shewed before by the testimony of *Hierome* to be no Canonically Scripture, nor of sufficient force to decide any point of controversie: as also that if it were, yet by the acknowledgement of *Alvarez* it makes not against Gods Decree of Reprobation, which wee maintaine. It hath also beene shewed before in what sense *God would have none to perish*, viz. by his Antecedent Will, with which yet will stand the Decree of Reprobation, as we hold it; which likewise hath been shewed, and that from both *Bellarmino*, and from *Alvarez* also. And that *God desires sinners may come to Repentance, and so to life*, Protestants (that I know) doe not deny, though they hold that *God doth give* (and so from all eternity did purpose to give) *Repentance*.

Nam cum Scriptum sit, Deus mortem non fecit, nec lætatur in perditione vivorum, utique qui neminem vult perire, cupit peccatores penitentiam agere, & per penitentiam denuo ad vitam redire. *Cypri. lib. 4. Epist. 2. vel edit. Pamel. Epist. 52.*

tance unto some, and not to others, as here pleaseth; which I have also shewed to be acknowledged by *Bellarmino, Abusque, Estius*, and others of the Church of Rome. And it is most cleare by that of the Apostle, *If God peradventure will give them Repentance*, 2 Tim. 2. 25; and that, *He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth*. Rom. 9. 18.

The third and last Father, who is here alledged, is *Ambrose de Cain & Abel lib. 2.* but what Chapter, (whereas there are ten in

Ideo omnibus operi sanctorum detulit, ut quicumque perierit, mortis suae causas sibi ascribat, qui curari noluit, cum remedium haberet, quo posset evadere: Christi autem manifesta in omnes praedicatur misericordia, eo quod ii qui pereunt, sui perirent negligentia, qui autem salvantur, secundum Christi sententiam liberentur, qui omnes homines vult salves fieri, & in agnitionem veritatis venire. Amb. de Cain & Abel. lib. 2. cap. 3.

cap. 3. ubi dicitur, ut quicumque perierit, mortis suae causas sibi ascribat, qui curari noluit, cum remedium haberet, quo posset evadere.

Asserimus nullos perire immerentes. Calv. Instit. li. 3. c. 23. Sec. 12.

that Booke) is not mentioned. Now I finde that *Chap. 3.* hath something, which probably was aimed at by the Marquesse, viz. this, *Christ therefore offered the helpe of healing unto all, that whosoever periseth, may ascribe the cause of his death to himselfe, who when he had a remedy, whereby he might escape, would not be cured. And that Christs mercy towards all might be made manifest, in that they that perish, doe perish by their own negligence, but they that are saved, are saved according to Christs sentence, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the acknowledgement of the truth.* Now I know no Protestant but hee will assent unto this, that *whosoever periseth, must ascribe the cause to themselves, and that they perish through their own default.* I have before cited *Calvin* asserting thus much, *That none doe perish without their desert.* But this assertion of his is very well consistent with his Doctrine about Reprobation, as I have shewed by the testimonies of diverse famous Writers of the Church of Rome. And whereas *Ambrose* saith, that such as perish, had a remedy, whereby they might escape, and that they therefore perish, because they would not be cured. No Protestants, (I suppose) will deny, but that such as perish through unbelieve, if they did believe, should be saved: but yet neverthelesse not Protestants onely, but Papists also (as I have shewed) doe hold, that God from all eternity did decree and purpose to give faith unto some, and not unto others, and that merely of his own will and pleasure. And that therefore according to *Aufine* (whose words are cited before) the prime and supreme cause why some are not saved,

is not because they will not, but because God will not. For that which *Ambrose* hath in the last place, who will have all men to be saved, &c. enough hath beene said before to shew, that in the judgement of *Aufine*, and diverse Romanists, it is nothing against the absolute decree of Reprobation; and so I have done with this point.

In the next place the Marquesse speaks of a mans assurance of his salvation, saying, that Protestants hold that a man ought to assure himselfe of it; and to prove the contrary, which they of the Roman Church doe hold, he alledgeth 1 Cor. 9. 27. saying, *S. Paul* was not assured, but that whilest he Preached to others, he himselfe might become a cast-away. And Rom. 11. 20. *Thou standest in the Faith: be not high minded, but feare, &c. lest thou also mayest be cut off.* And Phil. 2. 12. *Work out your own salvation with feare and trembling.*

Page 66. &
67.

Ans. Concerning this point, Protestants hold, 1. That a Christian may be assured of his salvation. 2. That a Christian ought to labour for this assurance. For the former of these positions wee have diverse places of Scriptures. As first that famous place Rom. 8. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39. *Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall Tribulation, or Distresse, or Persecution, &c. Nay in all these things we are more then conquerours through Him that loved us.* For I am perswaded, that neither Death, nor Life, nor Angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other Creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. So also that 2 Cor. 5. 1. *We know then if our earthly house of this Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternall in the Heavens,* And v. 6, 7, 8. *Therefore we are alwayes confident, knowing that while we are here in the body, we are absent from the Lord. For we walke by faith, and not by sight. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.* And that Phil. 1. 21. *To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.* And that 2 Tim. 4. 18. *The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me to his Heavenly Kingdom.* And in the same Chapter v. 6, 7, 8. *I am now ready to be offered, and my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have*

finished

finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, &c. So also S. Peter, Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us againe unto a lively hope, through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in Heaven for us. 1 Pet. 1. 3, 4. This hope, which believers have, or may have of salvation, is a lively hope; it is a hope, that maketh not ashamed. Rom. 5. 5. because they are sure to obtaine that which they hope for, and shall not be disappointed of it. Hence it is also that believers rejoyce with joy unspeakable, and full of glory; 1 Pet. 1. 8. because they know they shall receive the end of their faith, even the salvation of their soules. v. 9.

Wee have also Fathers to tell us this truth; There flourisheth

Viget apud nos spei robur, & firmitas fidei, & inter ipsas seculi labentis ruinas erecta mens est, & immobilis virtus, & nunquam non læta patientia, & de Deo suo semper anima securo: sicut per prophetam Spiritus S. loquitur, &c. Ego autem in Domino exultabo, & gaudebo in Deo salvatore meo. Cyprian. ad Demetrian.

with us (saith Cyprian) the strength of hope, and the firmness of faith; and amongst the very ruines of the decaying world the minde is raised up, and virtue is unmoveable, and patience is ever joyfull, and the soule is alwayes secure and confident of her God. And immediately hee confirms this by that of the Prophet Habakkuk, Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, &c. yet I will rejoyce in the Lord, I

will joy in the God of my salvation. Hab. 3. 17, 18.

So againe the same Father, * what place is there here for anxiety and carefulnesse? who in the midst of these things can be fearfull and sad, except he want hope and faith? It is for him to fear death, that would not go unto Christ: it is for him to be unwilling to go to Christ, that doth not believe that he doth begin to reigne with Christ. For it is written, The just shall live by faith. If thou beest just, and

* Quis hic anxietatis & sollicitudinis locus est? quis inter hæc trepidus & mortuus est, nisi cui spes & fides

deest? Ejus est enim mortem timere, qui ad Christum nolit ire: ejus est ad Christum nolle ire, qui se non credat cum Christo incipere regnare. Scriptum est enim, iustum fide vivere. Si iustus es, & fide vivis, si verè in Deum credis, cur non cum Christo futurus, & de Domini pollicitatione securus, quòd ad Christum voceris amplectaris, & quòd diabolo careas, gratularis? — Deus de hoc mundo recedentibus immortalitatem atque æternitatem pollicetur, & tu dubitas: hoc est Deum omnino non nosse; hoc est Christum credentium Dominum & magistrum peccato incredulitatis offendere; hoc est in Ecclesià constiguum fidem in domo fidei non habere. Cyprian. de mortalit.

doest

doest live by faith, if thou doest truly believe in God, seeing thou shalt be with Christ, and art sure of Gods promise, why doest thou not embrace this that thou art called unto Christ, and art glad that thou art freed from the Devill?—God doth promise immortality and eternity to those that depart out of this life, and thou doubtst: this is not at all to know God: this is to offend Christ, the Lord and Master of Believers, with the sinne of unbelieve: this is to be in the Church, the house of faith, and yet to have no faith. Here we see how earnest Cyprian is to prove that Christians may, yea ought to be confident against the feare of death, and that because they may and ought to be assured of the life to come.

Thus also * *Austine, I believe (saith hee) him that promisseth; The Saviour speaketh, the truth promiseth, he hath said unto me, He that heareth my words, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternall life, and is passed from death to life, and shall not come into condemnation. I have heard the words of my Lord, I have believed. Now whereas I was an unbeliever, I am made a Believer, as he hath said, I am passed from death to life, I come not into condemnation, not by my presumption, but by his promise.*

vitam æternam, & transitum facit de morte in vitam, & in iudicium non veniet; Ego audiivi verba Dmmini mei, credidi. Jam infidelis cum essem, factus sum fidelis, sicut ipse monuit, transii à morte ad vitam, ad iudicium non venio, non præsumptione meâ, sed ipsius promissione. Aug. tract. 22. in Joh.

* Credo promittenti, Salvator loquitur, veritas pollicetur, ipse dixit mihi, Qui audit verba mea, & credit ei qui misit me, habet

To this purposes also † *Bernard, The Sun of Righteousnesse arising (saith hee) the mystery concerning the predestinate, and those that shall be made blessed, which was so long hid, begins after a sort to come up out of the depth of eternity, whiles every one being called by feare, and justified by love (that is, by Faith working through love, as hee said a little before) doth assure himselfe that he is of the number of the blessed. Knowing that whom he hath justified them he hath also glorified. For why? Hee hears that he is called, when he is moved with feare; he perceives that he is justified, when he is filled with love: and shall he doubt of his being glorified?*

† Sic ad ortum solis iustitiæ, Sacramentum absconditum à seculis de prædestinatis, & beatificandis, emergere quodammodo incipit ex abyssu æternitatis, dū quisque vocatus per timorem, justificans per amorem, præsumit se quoque esse de numero beatorum; sciens nimirum quia quos justificavit, illos & magnificavit. Quid enim? Audit se vocari, cum timore concurrit, sentit & justificari, dū amore perfunditur, & de magnificatione diffidet? Ber. Epist. 107.

Habes homo
hujus arcani
indicem spiri-
tum justifican-
tem, eoque
ipso testifican-
tem spiritui tuo
quod filius Dei
& ipse sis.

Agnosce consilium Dei in justificatione tui——Præsens namque justificatio tui, & Divini est consilii revelatio, & quædam ad futuram gloriam præparatio. Aut certè prædestinatio ipsa potius præparatio est, justificatio autem magis jam appropinquatio. *Bern. Ibid.*

Iustus autem
quis est, nisi
qui amanti se
Deo vicem re-
pendit amoris?
Quod non fir-
miter revelante
Spiritu per fi-
dem homini
æternum Dei
propositum
super sua salute
futura. *Quæ*

sanè revelatio non est aliud quàm infusio gratiæ spiritualis, per quam dum facta carnis mor-
tificantur, homo ad regnum præparatur, quod caro & sanguis non possident, simul accipi-
ens in uno spiritu & unde se presumat amatum, & unde redamet, ne gratis amatus sit. *Bernard. Ibid.*

And againe, *Thou hast O man (saith hee) the justifying spirit a revealer of this secret, and so testifying unto thy spirit, that thou also art the Son of God. Acknowledge the counsell of God in thy justification.——For thy present justification is both a revelation of Gods Counsell, and also a certaine preparation unto future glory. Or truly predestination it selfe is rather a preparation, and justificati- on is rather an appropinquation unto it.*

And againe, *Who is righteous, but he that doth requite Gods love with love againe? which is not done but when the spirit by Faith doth reveale unto a man Gods eternall purpose concerning his future salvation. Which revelation surely is no other thing but the infusion of spiritual grace, by which the deeds of the flesh are mor- tified, and so a man is prepared for that Kingdome, which flesh and blood do not possesse, receiving together by one spirit both this, that he is assured that he is loved, and also this, that hee doth love againe, that so he may not be ungratefull to him, of whom he is loved.*

Thus both Scriptures and Fathers testifie that Christians may be assured of their salvation. And that this assurance may be had, may be proved also by all that hath beene said before concerning the stability of Faith once had, and the certainty of persevering in the estate of grace, if a man be once in it. For hence it followeth, that if a man can be assured that hee is in the estate of Grace, hee may also be assured of his salvation. Now that he may be assured of his being in the state of grace some of the Romish Church, and that since *Luthers* time, have maintained, as namely *Catharinus*, and the Author of the Booke called *Enchiridium Colonienſe*, both which are mentioned in this respect by

by *Belarmine*. And because the Councell of Trent Sess. 6. c. 9. *Bell. de Justif*
doth seeme to determine the contrary, therefore *Eisengrenius* l. 3. c. 3.
hath written a whole booke to shew that the determination of
the Councell is not indeed against this, that a man may be as-
sured that he hath true grace in him. The booke I have seene
and read many yeeres agoe, though now I have it not; And I
remember he holds that a man may be as sure that hee hath true
grace, and that his sinnes are forgiven, as hee is sure that twice
two make foure, and that the whole is greater then a part, and
as hee is sure of those things which hee sees with his eyes, and
feeles with his hands. That a man may have this assurance of
his present estate the Scripture plainly shewes, 1 *Joh. 3. 14. We*
know that we are passed from death to life, because we love the
Brethren.

Whereupon sayes * *Austine*, *Let none*
aske man, let every one returne unto his own
heart, if there he can finde brotherly love let
him be secure that he is passed from death to
life. So Rom. 8. 16. *The Spirit himselfe*

doth beare witnesse with our spirits, that we
are the sonnes of God. Upon which words
† *Cajetan* saith thus, *By this testimony we see*
clearly, that we must believe that we are the sons of God. So also
1 *Joh. 3. 24. Hereby we know that he (viz. Christ) abideth in us,*
by the Spirit which he hath given us. And 1 Cor. 2. 12. We
have received the spirit of God, that we may know the things that are
freely given unto us of God. *Belarmine* sayes

this place is not meant of the knowledge of
Gods benefits, which belong unto this or
that man in particular, but of the know-
ledge of those benefits, which God hath
prepared for his Elect, as the inheritance
and glory of the Kingdome of Heaven. But
if the Apostle speakes onely of our know-
ing what good things God hath prepared in generall for the
Elect, what is this more then appertaines to the very Devils?
for they know that God hath prepared Heaven, and hap-
pinesse for the Elect; *Cajetan* therefore is more ingenuous,

* *Nemo interroget hominem, redeat*
unusquisque ad cor suum, si ibi inve-
nerit charitatem fraternam, securus sit
quia transit à morte ad vitam. *Aug.*
in 1 Joh. 5. in 1 Joh.

† *Ex hoc testimonio clarè videmus,*
credendum nobis esse quòd sumus filii
Dei. *Caj. in Rom. 8. 16.*

Non loquitur Apostolus de notitiâ
beneficiorum Dei, quæ in particulari
ad hunc, aut illum pertinent, sed de
notitiâ beneficiorum, quæ Deus
præparavit electis suis, qualia sunt
in primis hæreditas, & gloria regni
cælorum. *Bell. de Justif. lib. 3. cap. 9.*

Spiritus S. infusus Apostolis causavit in illis noticiam certam donorum Dei in eisdem — Apostoli certam habebant noticiam, quod fides, spes, charitas, & alia dona gratis data eis erant à Deo. *Cajetan ad 1 Cor. 2. 12.*

expounding it of the holy Ghost infused into the Apostles, and causing them certainly to know the gifts of God, that were in them. *The Apostles* (saith hee) *had a certaine knowledge, that Faith, Hope, Charity, and other gifts, were freely given unto them of God.* To adde but one place more,

viz. that 1 Joh. 5. 13. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that you may know that ye have eternall life. True (sayes Bellarmine) *the Apostle saith indeed, These things I write unto you that believe, that you may know that you have eternall life : but hee doth not say, These things I write unto you, that you may know that you believe, as you ought to believe. But (say I) the Apostle here did suppose*

that they that truly believe, may know that they doe so ; for otherwise how should they that believe, know that therefore they have life eternall, except they first know that they doe believe ?

Now for the Scriptures objected against us, that *1 Cor. 9. 27. Lest having preached to others, I my selfe should be a cast-away*, cannot be so understood, as that *Paul* was uncertaine either of his present justification, or of his future glorification ; for that will not consist with many other sayings of his before cited. The meaning therefore is onely this, that *Pauls* care was that his Preaching and his conversation might be suitable, and that the one might not confound the other. The word here rendred *cast-away*, and *2 Cor. 13. 5. reprobate*, is neither here nor there taken in opposition to *elect*, but is as much as *reproved*, so the word properly doth import ; as without the privative Particle it signifies *approved*, *1 Cor. 11. 19. That Rom. 11. 20. Thou standest by faith, be not high minded, but feare*, is nothing against assurance of salvation, which doth well consist with feare, *viz.* such a feare as is opposit to high-mindednesse ; this feare making us keepe close unto God, and not to depart from him, *Jer. 32. 40. And whereas it is said Rom. 11. 22. Lest thou also mayst (or as wee reade it, otherwise thou also shalt) be cut off, it is spoken by the Apostle*

Ait quidem, Hæc scribo vobis qui creditis, ut sciatis, quia vitam habetis æternam : sed non ait, Hæc scribo vobis, ut sciatis vos habere fidem, qualis requiritur. *Bell. de Justif. lib. 1. cap. 11.*

ad Rom. 11. 20.

ad Rom. 11. 22.

Apostle to the Church of *Rome*, and serves well to shew that any particular visible Church, even that of *Rome*, may faile; but from hence cannot be inferred, that a true Believer may fall away, and perish. Neither is the assurance of salvation infringed by that *Phil. 2.12. Worke out your own salvation with feare and trembling.* For as for our working out of our salvation, it hinders not but that we may be assured of our salvation. We may be assured of that, which yet wee must use meanes to obtaine. *Ezekiah* was assured that fiftene yeares should be added unto his life, because God by his Prophet had told him so, *Isai. 38.5.* Yet hee used meanes for his recovery, *v. 21.* and so no question but he did for the preservation of his life, by eating and drinking, and the like. *Paul* also was assured, that both hee; and all in the Ship with him should escape, because God by his Angell had revealed it unto him, *Act. 27.23, 24.25.* yet neverthelesse he saw it needfull to use meanes, whereby they might escape, *Act. 27.31.* And for those words, *with feare and trembling*, they doe not imply diffidence and doubting, but humility and lowlinesse of minde; feare and trembling being here the same as *Romans 11.20. viz.* that which is opposit to pride and high-mindednesse. The Apostle *2 Cor. 7.15.* saith that the Corinthians received *Titus* with feare and trembling, that is, with all humility and reverence. So we must worke out our own salvation with feare and trembling, that is with reverence and with godly feare, as is expressed *Heb. 12.28.* But this is no argument at all why wee may not be assured of our salvation; no more then it followes that therefore the Corinthians could not be assured of *Titus* his love and good will towards them, and that he came unto them for their good, because they received him in that manner.

David *Psal. 2.11.* bids serve the Lord with feare, and joyce with trembling. Therefore there may bee feare and trembling, and yet rejoicing too, and consequently assurance of Gods love and favour; for without assurance of it there can be no sound rejoicing in it. Joy (as *Ramundus de Sa-* Gaudium oritur ex hoc, quod aliqua res scit se habere id quod habet, non ex hoc, quod habet. *Ramund. de Sa-* bund. Theolog. natural. tit. 95.

Now for the fathers here alleged by the Marquels, viz. *Am. Ser. 5. in*

Hope maketh not ashamed. Rom. 5. And every one that hath this hope, purifieth himselfe, &c. 1 Ioh. 3.3.

Ut in timore Deo serviant, id est, non alitè sapiant, sed timeant, quod significat, non superbiant, sed humiles sint. *Aug. de corrupt. et grat. 6.9.*

Pfal. 118. Basil. in Const. Monast. cap. 2. Hieron. 2. advers. Pelag. Chrys. hom. 87. in Joh. Aug. in Psal. 40. Bern. Ser. 3. de Advent. & Ser. 1. de Sept. I answer, it's true, Ambrose

saieth, David desired that his reproach, which he suspected, might be taken away, either because he had thought in his heart, but had not done it; and though it were abolished by Repentance, yet he was fearfull lest perhaps the reproach of it did yet remaine; and therefore he prays God to take it away, who alone knows that which even he may be ignorant of that hath done it. But this doth not argue that a man cannot in Ambroses judgement be assured of his salvation; it onely shewes (contrary to what the Papists hold) that a man cannot be justified and saved by his owne inherent righteousness, because though he be otherwise never so righteous, yet still there is some sinne in him, which hee knoweth not of; according to that of the Apostle (which Ambrose there citeth) I know nothing by my selfe, yet am I not thereby justified, 1 Cor. 4. 4. The Apostle denieth that hee was justified by that righteousness that was in him, though hee had the testimony of a good conscience to rejoyce in, 2 Cor. 1. 12. yet was hee nevertheless assured that hee was justified, and should be saved through faith in Christ Jesus, as hath been proved before from Rom. 8. 33. &c. and from other places. This was all that

* Subobscurè dictum videtur, sed explanavit Apostolus quod hic videbatur obscurum, ubi ait, Nihil mihi conscius sum, sed non in hoc iustificatus sum. Sciebat n. se esse hominem, & sibi cavebat ut poterat, ne post suscepta baptismi Sacramenta peccaret; ideoque delicti sibi conscius non erat: sed quia homo erat, peccatorem se fatebatur, sciens unum esse Jesum lumen verum, qui peccatum non fecit, nec est inventus in ore ejus dolus, ipsum solum iustificari, qui verè alienus esset à lapsu.

Ambros. Ser. 5. in Ps. 118. (vel. 119) 39.

Ambrose meant, as appeares by his words immediately going before those objected; The Apostle (hee saith) Explaines Davids meaning saying, I know nothing by my selfe, yet am I not thereby justified. He knew that he was a man, and did take heed to himselfe as he could, that he might not sin after his Baptisme; therefore he knew nothing by himselfe; but because he was a man, he confessed himselfe a sinner, knowing that Jesus alone is the true light, who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, that he

** Ambrose meant, as appeares by his words immediately going before those objected; The Apostle (hee saith) Explaines Davids meaning saying, I know nothing by my selfe, yet am I not thereby justified. He knew that he was a man, and did take heed to himselfe as he could, that he might not sin after his Baptisme; therefore he knew nothing by himselfe; but because he was a man, he confessed himselfe a sinner, knowing that Jesus alone is the true light, who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, that he*

Ambros. Ibid.

alone

alone is justified (i.e. perfectly just in himselfe) who was truly without all sin.

That which *Basil* (whose words I find in *Bellarmino*, though otherwise I have him not to peruse) saith, is directly to the same purpose, and imports no more then that of *Ambrose*. We doe

not understand (saith he) many things where-

in we sin. Therefore the Apostle saith, I know

nothing by my selfe, yet am I not thereby

justified, that is, I sin in many things, and am

not aware of it. For *Hierome*, hee is too

loosely cited both by the *Marquesse*, and

before him by *Bellarmino*, there being

eleven long Chapters in that booke which

is mentioned, but in which of them he saith

any thing against us, they doe not tell us.

However the words objected are these.

There are righteous men, to whom is happeneth

according to the work of the wicked: and

there are wicked men, to whom is happeneth

according to the work of the righteous. This

is said (viz. *Ecclesi. 8. 14.*) because certaine

judgement belongs only unto God. These words by search I finde

in *Hierome*; but it plainly appears, that his scope onely is to

prove against the *Pelagians*, that no man in this life is so righteous,

as to be without sinne, which is not against us in this controversy,

but for us in another, as hath beene shewed before.

A little after those words *Hierome* saith

thus, What mortall man is not taken with some

error? And that the righteous shall scarcely

be saved (1 *Pet. 4. 18.*) because in some

things (or rather indeed in all things) he

stands in needs of Gods mercy. In the former Chapter *Hierome* brings in that of *S. Paul*;

I know nothing by my selfe, &c. and

saith, that though the Apostle were

not confessions to himselfe of sinne, yet hee

did not justifie himselfe, because hee had

read (*Psal. 19. 13.*) who can understand his

Bell. de Justif. li. 3. cap. 7.

Multa peccantes, plurima neque intelligimus. Quapropter dicit Apost. Nihil mihi conscius sum, sed non in hoc justificatus sum, h.e. multa pecco, & non intelligo. *Bas. de Constit. Monast. cap. 2.*

Sunt iusti, ad quos pervenit quasi opus impiorum, & sunt impii, ad quos pervenit quasi opus iustorum. Hoc idcirco dicitur, quia certum iudicium solius Dei est. *Hier. adv. Pelag. l. 2. c. 2.*

Quis mortalium aliquo errore non capitur? — Vix salvarur (iustus) in eo, quod in quibusdam Dei indiget misericordia. *Hieron. Ibid.*

Nihil mihi conscius sum, &c. Qui hoc dicebat, nullius utique peccati tibi conscius erat: sed quia legerat, Delicta quis intelligit? &c. idcirco temperabat sententiam, &c. *Hieron. advers. Pelag. l. 2. c. 7.*

his faults ? Thus then his testimony makes indeed against the perfection of a mans own righteousnesse ; but not against his assurance of salvation , which may well stand without the other.

Propterea contristatus sum , ne forte me amare arbitrarus , non amem : ut antea cum me fortem & constantem putarem , postmodum imbecillis deprehensus sum. *Chrys. Hom. 87. in Job.*

Chrysostome in the place cited , comments upon that *Job. 21. 17. Peter was grieved, because he said unto him the third time, lovest thou me ?* and hee saith, that *Peter* feared lest now hee thought himselfe to love *Christ*, when hee did not ; as before he was

deceived in thinking himselfe stout and constant, when it proved otherwise.

But 1. Though *Chrysostome* so take the words of *Peter* , as if he might then be mistaken in that opinion which hee had of himselfe : yet it does not follow that therefore hee should hold that a man cannot be assured that hee hath saving grace in him.

2. *Austine* gives another, and a better reason , why *Peter* was grieved that *Christ* did aske him that question the third time,

Cum jam tertio ille rædio afficeretur , quasi non sibi crediderit. *Aug. in 1 Job. Tract. 5.*

viz. because thereby *Christ* (as he thought) seemed not to believe him ; not that hee suspected his owne heart , but hee feared that *Christ* did suspect him , because he did aske him the same question thrice over.

Magis probo quod scribit Theodorus Heracleotes , contristatum fuisse , quod cum *Christus* eum tam sepe , & tam diligenter interrogaverat , indicare videretur se illum suspectum habere &c. propterea respondisse , Domine tu nosti , &c. q.d. Tu , qui omnia nosti , ignorare non potes verum esse , quod dico : quid ergo , quasi mihi non credens , me tam sæpè rogas ? *Maldon. in Job. 21. 16, 17, 18.*

Quod subjungit , Domine tu scis , non solum moderationis causâ dictum putari , sed multo etiam magis , ut quod dixerat , etiam , ipse *Christi* testimonio confirmaret. *Maldon. Ibid.*

Maldonate the Jesuite cites *Theodorus Heracleotes* , as also thus expounding it , and saying , that therefore *Peter* answered , *Lord, thou knowest all things , thou knowest that I love Thee* ; as if hee should have said , *Thou that knowest all things , canst not but know that it is true that I say : and therefore why dost thou aske mee so often , as if thou didst not believe me ?* This Exposition *Maldonate* doth prefer before the other of *Chrysostome* , which he also mentioneth , and saith , that *Peter* saying , *Lord, thou knowest* , did speak so , not so much out of modesty , as to confirme that which hee had said , (*viz.* that he loved *Christ*) by *Christi* own testimony.

Austine

Austine in *Psal.* 40. hath nothing (that I can see) to the purpose; I suppose it should be in *Psalme* 41. from whence *Bellarmino* doth produce this, I know that the righteousness of God doth remaine, whether my righteousness may remaine, I know not. For the *Apostle* doth make me to feare, saying, Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heede lest he fall. (1 Cor. 10. 12.) I acknowledge these words of *Austine*; but that which followes immediately, shewes the meaning of them. Therefore (saith hee) because I have no strength (or stability) in my selfe, neither have I hope of my selfe, my soule is troubled toward my selfe. Wouldst thou not have it troubled? Doe not abide in thy selfe, but, say, unto thee, O Lord, have I lift up my soule (Psal. 25. 1.) Heare this more plainly, Doe not hope of thy selfe, but of thy God. For if thou dost hope of thy selfe, thy soule will be troubled towards thee, because it hath not yet found whereby it may be secure of thee. Therefore because my soule is troubled towards me, what remains but humility; that the soule doe not presume of it selfe? Thus it clearly appeares, that *Austine* spake not against assurance of salvation, but onely against selfe-confidence, and presumption.

The last Father alledged is *Bernard*, who saith, This doth adde to the heape of care, and to the weight of feare, that when as it's necessary to looke both to mine own, and my Neighbours conscience, neither of them is sufficiently knowne unto me. Both are an unsearchable depth, both are night unto me.

But *Bernard* onely meanes that it's very hard for a man to know his owne heart, because of the deceitfulness of it, not but that by the Spirit of God a man may know it so farre forth as to be assured of the truth of Grace in him; which hath beene proved before by *Bernards* testimony in diverse places. So elsewhere hee saith indeed, *Who can say, I am of the Elect,*

Novi quia justitia Dei manet, ultram meam maneat nescio. Terret enim me *Apost.* dicens, Qui se putat stare, videat ne cadat. *Aug.* in *Psal.* 41. 8.

Ergo quia non est in me firmitas mihi, nec est mihi spes de me, ad me ipsum turbata est anima mea. Vis non conturbetur? Non remaneas in teipso, & dic, Ad te Domine levavi animam meam. Hoc planius audi, Noli sperare de te, sed de Deo tuo. Nam si speras de te, anima tua conturbabitur ad te, quia nondum invenit unde sit segura de te. Ergo quoniam ad me conturbata est anima mea, quid restat nisi humilitas, ut de se ipsa anima non presumat? *Aug.* *Ibid.*

Accedit ad sollicitudinis cumulum, & pondus timoris, quod cum & meam, & proximi conscientiam servare necesse sit, neutra mihi satis est nota. Utraque abyssus est imperscrutabilis, utraque mihi nox est, &c. *Bern.* *Ser.* 3. de Adventu.

Quis potest dicere, Ego de electis sum, ego de predestinatis ad vitam, ego de numero filiorum? Quis hæc, inquam, dicere potest? reclamante nimirum Scripturâ, Nescit homo si sit dignus amore, in odio. Certitudinem utique non habemus, sed spei fiducia consolatur nos, ne dubitationis anxietate penitus cruciemur. Bern. Ser. 1. in. *Sermone.*

I am of those that are predestinate unto life, I am of the number of Gods children? Who, I say, can say these things? the Scripture saying on the contrary, Man knows not whether he be worthy of love, or hatred. Surely we have no certainty, but the confidence of hope doth comfort us, lest we should be tormented with the anxiety of doubting.

But 1. Bernard here builds upon a false ground, viz. that the Scripture saith, *No*

man knows whether he be worthy of love or hatred, i. e. whether hee be in such an estate, as to be loved of God, or hated of him: whereas Salomon Eccles. 9. 1. (which place he meaneth) onely saith, No man knoweth love or hatred by all that is before them; that is, by outward things which befall men, as prosperity and adversity, they cannot conclude either that God doth love, or that hee doth hate them: because (as it followes immediately) All things come alike to all, i. e. all outward things; prosperity happens to the wicked, and adversity to the godly; and therefore there is no judging of Gods love, or hatred by these things: yet it followes not but that by other marks and trials a man may know whether God love him or no; and so much Bernard himselfe hath confessed, as I have shewed.

2. Neither doth Bernard heere absolutely deny that any can know himselfe to be of the number of those that shall be saved, onely he denies such a knowledge, so sure and certaine, as to exclude all care of obtaining salvation. For so hee addes immediately, *Therefore there are given certaine signes, and manifest tokens of salvation, that it may be without doubt that he is of the number of the Elect, in whom these signes shall remaine. Therefore, I say, Whom God foreknew, them also he predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son, that to whom he denies certainty, that they may be carefull, he yet affords confidence, that they may have comfort.* I grant, that Bernard presently after seemes

Propter hoc data sunt signa quædam & indicia manifesta salutis, ut indubitable sit cum esse de numero electorum, in quo ea signa permanent. Propter hoc, inquam, quos præcivit Deus, & prædestinavit conformari fieri imaginem filii sui, ut quibus certitudinem negat causa sollicitudinis, vel fiduciam præstet gratia consolationis, Bern. *Ibid.*

I grant, that Bernard presently after seemes to

to be very peremptory against a mans being assured of his perseverance, saying, *What we are we may know, at least in part: What we shall be, that is altogether impossible for us to know.* But it hath beene proved before

both by Scriptures and Fathers, that true justifying faith once had cannot bee wholly lost. And even Bernard himselfe (as before is shewed) doth hold that a man may know assuredly that he is justified, and that therefore hee shall be glorified, because the Apostle saith that *whom God hath justified, them also he hath glorified*, that is, will certainly glorifie, *Rom. 8.30.*

And therefore here hee must be understood as intending only to prevent security, and a casting off all care for the future.

For so immediately hee goes on, *Therefore let him that standeth take heed lest he fall: and let him continue and goe on in that, which is both a token of salvation, and an argument of Predestination.* Thus then notwithstanding

any thing contained either in the Scriptures, or the Fathers, which are alledged, the Doctrine of Protestants concerning assurance of salvation doth remaine firme and sure, viz. that a man may have this assurance. And if so, then surely (which is the other position) all ought to labour for this assurance, it being to be had, and well worth the labouring for that it may be had; the Scripture also requiring us to *give diligence to make our calling and our election sure*, 2 Pet. 1.10.

To proceede, *We say* (saith the Marquesse) *that every man hath an Angel guardian; you say he hath not.* *We have Scripture for it, viz. Mat. 18. 10. Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in Heaven there Angels do alwayes behold the face of my Father.* Acts 12. 13. *S. Peter knocking at the door, they say, It is his Angel. They believed this in the Apostles time. The Fathers believe it, &c.* Page 67.

Answer. For every ones having a peculiar Angel to guard him, I know not any great controversie that there is betwixt Protestants and them of the Church of Rome about it. *Bellarmino* in all his three great volumes of controversies hath none of this that I doe finde. Whether severall Believers have severall

Quales sumus, nosse possumus, vel ex parte; quales autem futuri sumus, id nosse penitus nobis impossibile est. Bern. Ibid.

Itaque qui stat, videat ne cadat, & in forma; quæ salutis indicium est, & argumentum prædestinationis, perseveret atque proficiat. Bern. Ibid.

Angels for their guardians *Calvin* neither affirms, nor denies; *Instit. lib. 1. cap. 14. Sect. 7.* The Rhemists on *Mat. 18. 10.* say that he will needs doubt of it, but that he dares not deny it. The Scripture is cleare for this, that the Angels are appointed to guard the Elect; *They are all ministering spirits, sent forth to Minister for those that shall be heires of salvation, Heb. 1. 14.* The like is to be seene in other places, as *Psal. 34. 7.* and *91. 11.* But that every one hath his peculiar Angell, this is not so cleare but that we may well doubt of it. Yea, if it be so understood, that each believer hath onely one Angell guarding him, it will not agree with that *Psal. 91. 11. He hath given his Angels charge over thee, to keep thee, &c.* Nor with that *Gen. 32. 1, 2.* Where it is said that as *Jacob* was returning out of *Mesopotamia* into *Canaan*, the Angells of God met him; and therefore hee called the name of the place *Mahanaim*, that is, two Campes, or two Hosts, viz. that of his owne, and the other of the Angels. In

Hoc quidem pro certo habendum, non tantum uni Angelo unumquemque nostrum esse curæ, sed omnes uno consensu vigilare pro salute nostrâ. *Calv. Instit. lib. 1. cap. 4. Sect. 7. Similita habet ad Mat. 18. 10.*

this therefore *Calvin* might well be confident, as hee was, that every one of us hath not only one Angell to care for us, but that they all wish one consent to watch for our safety. This, hee saith, is to be held for certaine.

Neither durst the Rhemists, or any others (that I know) quarrell with him about

it. For those two places, which the Marquesse alledgeth, they are neither of them sufficient to prove that every believer hath his peculiar Angell. That *Mat. 18. 10.* where our Saviour speaking of believers, calles the Angells *their Angels*, doth evince no more then this, that believers have the Angels to attend upon them. For there is no necessity to understand it so that each particular Believer hath his particular Angell; no more then because it's said, *obey your guides* (τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν) or *governours*, *Heb. 13. 17.* therefore each one hath his peculiar guide or governour: or because its said *Isai. 3. 4. I will give children to be there Princes*, therefore each severall person had his severall Prince, or Magistrate. The other place, viz. *A&S 12. 15. it is his Angell, viz. Peters*, is more obscure, neither (I confesse) doe I well know how to understand it. Some by *Angell* there understand not a celestiall spirit, but a messenger,

as the Greeke word ἄγγελος, whence the Latine *Angelus*, and the English *Angell* is derived, doth primarily import. And they conceive this to be the meaning, that the Damofell did not tell those within, that she heard *Peters* voyce, but onely said, that *Peter* was at the doore, and she constantly affirming this, they supposed that *Peter* had sent some messenger, and that the Damofell mistaking what he said, imagined that *Peter* himselfe was there. But it is not probable but that the Damofell would signifie that it was *Peters* voyce, which she heard, the Scripture expressly saying, *v. 14. that she knew Peters voyce.* On the other-side, if a Heavenly Angell be there meant, it seemes to imply, that they supposed the Angell that garded *Peter*, and therefore is called *his Angell*, to represent the person of *Peter*, and to assume his voyce; which conceit seemes very uncouth. However, if such an Angell be there meant, yet onely this can be inferred from thence, that *Peter* had his Angell to guard him; but it followes not, that therefore he had an Angell proper and peculiar to himselfe, and that only one certaine Angell was appointed his guardian.

*Cancr. Myrob.
ad Añ. 12. 15.*

Neither doe the Fathers, that are cited, (so far as I can see) speake home to the point in question. *Gregory* of whom mention is first made, is here so impertinently alledged, that I suppose there was some oversight in it. For hee speakes nothing at all of the Angels guarding men, but onely of their being present at the celebration of the Eucharist; which is nothing to our present purpose.

Quis enim fidelium habere dubium possit, in ipsa immolationis hora, ad sacerdotis vocem celos aperiri, in illo Jesu Christi mysterio Angelorum choros adesse, &c. Greg. dial. lib. 4. cap. 58.

Athanasius, who is mentioned next, saith onely that there are some supercaelestiall powers, *qui apud homines permanent*, that doe abide with men, and are *hominum pedagogi*, mens instructors or governours: but of particular Angels belonging to particular men hee speakes nothing. *Chrysostome* in one place, which the Marquesse quoteth, speakes of the Angels being present, when the Eucharist is celebrated, and of their conveying to Heaven the soules of such, as immediately before their death with a pure conscience received that Sacrament; which hee saith one told him, that saw it; but to the question now agitated,

Athanas. de commandi essentia, sub finem.

Chrysost. de Sacerd. lib. 6.

ed, I finde not that hee saith any thing in that place. Indeed
Hom. 3. (not as it is misquoted, *Hom. 2.*) in *Coloss.* hee citeth,

Unusquisque n. fidelis habet angelum.
Chrys. hom. 3. in Coloss. Similiter, ad Mat.
18. 10. His innuit verbis nostrum
 unumquemlibet angelum habere.

Mat. 18. 10. and saith, *Every Believer hath*
an Angel: but this doth not necessarily im-
 port, that each Believer hath his peculiar
 Angell. What *Gregorius Tironensis* saith,

(whose testimony is the next) wanting his
 works, I cannot yet examine. The next after him is *Austine*, but
 he is mis-alleged, viz. *Epist. ad Probam cap. 19.* Whereas there are
 but 16. Chapters in that Epistle, which is wholly about prayer,
 and hath nothing (that I finde) about Angels. The last witness

Magna dignitas animarum, ut uni-
quæque habeat ab ortu natiuitatis in
custodiam sui Angelum delegatum.
Hieron. in Mat. 18. 10.

Unde legimus in *Apocalypsi Joannis*,
 Angelo Ephesi, Thyatiræ, et Angelo
 Philadelphiæ, & angelis quatuor re-
 liquarum Ecclesiarum scribe hæc.
Hieron. Ibid.

is *Hierome*, who saith indeed, *Great is the*
dignity of soules, that every one from his birth
hath an Angell appointed to keepe him. But
 it doth not appeare, that he thought every
 one to have his peculiar Angell. The con-
 trary rather appeares by that which hee
 addes immediatly after, viz. that hereupon
John Revel. 2. & 3. was bidden to write to
 the Angell of *Ephesus, Thyatira, Philadel-*

phia, and the other foure Churches there mentioned. Though
Hierome doe mis-interpret the Angels there spoken of in the *Re-*
velation, and therefore both hee, and some others of the an-
 cientes are in this rejected by *Ribera*, yet thereby we may per-
 ceive, that he did not hold every one to have a peculiar Angell,
 but one Angell to be for a whole Church. If it be said, that
 there by Angell he meant Angells, the singular number being put
 for the plurall, the same may be said concearning the other words
 which are objected. But enough of this point; there is more con-
 troversie about those that follow.

Riber. in Apoc.
1. ult.

Page 67.

We say (saith the Marquess) *the Angels pray for us, know-*
ing our thoughts, and deeds: you deny it. We have Scripture for it,
Zach. 1. 9, 10, 11, 12. Then the Angell of the Lord answered, and
 said, *O Lord of hostes, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusa-*
lem, and on the Cities of Judah, against whom thou hast had indig-
nation these threescore and ten yeares? *Apoc. 8. 4.* And the smock
 of the incense of the prayers of the Saints ascended from the hand of
 the Angell before the Lord. This place was so understood by

Irenæus

Irenæus lib. 4. cap. 34. and S. Hilary in Psal. 129. tells us, This intercession of Angels Gods Nature needeth not, but our infirmities doe. So S. Ambrose lib. de viduis, Victor Oris. lib. 3. de persecut. Vandal.

Ans^r. Had the Marquesse onely said, that the Angels know our deedes, and pray for us, there had beene little cause to oppose: but whereas hee saith that they know our thoughts, that may not bee granted, the Scripture making this Gods Prerogative. *For thou, even thou onely knowest the hearts of all the children of men.* 1 Kings 8. 39. † *Theophylact* therefore upon *Luke 5. 22.* saith that CHRIST proved himselfe to be God by this, that (as it is there said) hee knew mens thoughts. And the same also is observed by * *Jansen* in his Comment upon the place. For that in *Zach. 1. 12.*

Ἰδὼν ὅτι θεὸς ἔστι. θεὸν γὰρ ἰδὼν εἶπεν καὶ οὗτος. Theophyl. in Luc. 5.

* Ostendit sibi competere, quod etiam Scripturæ Deo proprium esse passim docent, dum declarat se cordium esse inspectorem, &c. *Jansen. Concord. cap. 32.*

some by the Angell there spoken of understand Christ, the Angel (or Messenger) of the Covenant, as he is called *Mal. 3. 1.* But others understand a created Angell, viz. the Angell that talked with the Prophet *Zachary*, and thence observe that the Angels pray for the Church. This seemes more probable by the words immediately following, *And the Lord answered the Angell that talked with me, v. 13.* In the other place, viz. *Revel. 8. 4.* *Ribera* telleth us, that many thinke the Angell there mentioned to be Christ. And though he dislike that Exposition, yet it is more then probable by that which is said *v. 3.* *There was given him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all Saints, &c.* For what can we well understand by that incense, but Christs Merit and Meditation, whereby the prayers of the Saints are acceptable and well pleasing unto God?

For the Fathers alledged, * *Irenæus* speaketh not either of this Angell spoken of *Revel. 8. 4.* or at all of Angells praying

diriguntur, & ad templum, quemadmodum Joan. in Apocal. ait, Et apertum est templum Dei, & tabernaculum. Ecce enim, inquit, tabernaculum Dei, in quo habitabit hominibus. Iren. lib. 4. cap. 34.

Vulg. Angelus testamenti.

Hunc multi Christum esse existimant. *Rib. ad Apoc. 8. 3.* The same also is confessed by the *Rhemists* upon the place.

* Est ergo altare in caelis. Illac enim preces nostræ

for us. All that he saith is, that there is an altar in Heaven, to which our prayers must be directed : and then hee cites *John* saying in the *Revelation*, that the Temple and Tabernacle of God was opened : but this is nothing to the point in hand.

Intercessione itaque horum non natura Dei eger, sed infirmitas nostra.
Hilar. in P/al. 129.

Hilary is truly cited, speaking of the intercession of Angels, he saith, that not Gods Nature, but our infirmity doth stand in need of it.

Whether the blessed spirits pray for us, is not here the question, but whether we are to pray unto them. B. Vliet. Answ. p. 421. He speaks of the Saints, but is may hold of the Angels. Hieron. præfat. in Proverb.

But (as I said before) I see not why wee should deny, that the Angels pray for us; for it doth not therefore follow, that wee may pray to them; which is the next point to be considered. Yet I should have liked it better, if *Hilary* had grounded himselfe upon that place of *Zachary*, which the Marquesse produced, then that hee should build upon the Booke of *Tobit* (as also doth *Ambrose Ser.* 92. for I finde nothing this way in the place, which the Marquesse quoteth) that Booke (as *Hierome* long agoe hath censured it) being Apocryphall, and of no authority for the determining of matters of this nature. What the last Author saith, viz. *Victor Viicensis*, being not furnished with his Booke, I cannot tell; neither is there neede to inquire after him, hee being alledged for no more then *Hilarie*, and hee asserting no more then (I thinke) may be granted.

Page 68.

But from the angels praying for us the Marquess passeth to our praying to the angels. *We hold it lawfull* (saith hee) *to pray unto them: you not. We have Scripture for it, Gen. 48. 16. The Angell which redeemed me from all evill, blesse these Lads, &c. Hof. 12. 4. He had power over the Angell, and prevailed: he wept and made supplications unto them. S. Austine expounding these words of Job 19. 21. Have pity upon me, O yee my friends, for the hand of the Lord is upon me, saith, that holy Job addressed himself to the Angels.*

Prayer is a worship, a Religious worship as our adversaries gr̃at. Now worshiping of Angels is condemned, Col. 2. 18. & Revel. 19. 10. & 22. 9.

Answ. That it is lawfull to pray unto angels, Protestants deny, and that justly, there being no ground, nor warrant for it in the Scripture, but much against it. For the Scripture every where teacheth and requireth us to pray unto God, and to none other. *Call upon me in the day of trouble. Psal. 50. 15. After this manner therefore pray yee, Our Father, &c. Mat. 6. 9. When*

ye pray say our Father, &c. Luke 11.2. In the day of my trouble I will call upon thee. Psal. 85.7. As for me I will call upon God. Psal. 55.16. For this shall every one that is godly pray unto thee. Psal. 32.6. How shall they call upon him, in whom they have not believed? Rom. 10.14. Now wee both professe in the Creed, and so are taught in the Scripture, to believe onely in God. That your faith and hope might be in God. 1 Pet. 1.21. Ye believe in God, believe also in me. Joh. 14.1. viz. because Christ, who there speakes, is God. Prayer must proceede from the heart, and not from the lips onely. Give eare unto my prayer, that goeth not out of fained lips. Psal. 17.1. Vnto thee O Lord doe I lift up my soule. Psal. 25.1. Poure forth your hearts unto him. Psal. 62.8. Hannah spake in her heart, &c. 1 Sam. 1.13. Now God only knoweth the heart, as was shewed before.

The Fathers were of this minde. ^a *Tertullian* writing of prayer, and expounding the Lords Prayer, upon the first words of it saith, *We pray unto God.* And afterwards in the same book, ^b *We commend our prayers unto God:* neither does hee speake of praying unto any other. And elsewhere, ^c *We call upon the Eternal God* (saith he) *for the safety of the Emperours.* ^d And againe more fully to the purpose, *These things I cannot pray for from any other, but from him, from whom I know I shall obtaine; because he it is, who alone doth give them.*

^a Nam & Deum oramus, &c. Tertull. de orat. cap. 2.
^b Commendamus Deo preces nostras. Ibid. cap. 13.
^c Nos pro salute imperatorum, Deum invocamus

eternum, &c. Tertull. Apolog. cap. 30. ^d Hæc ab alio orare non possum, quàm à quo me scio consecuturum, quoniam & ipse est, qui solus præstat, &c. Tertull. Ibid.

So *Cyprian* also writing of the Lords Prayer, all along supposeth, and taketh it for granted, that it is God to whom wee must pray. Hee saith that *to pray otherwise then Christ hath taught us, is not only ignorance, but a sin also.* Now Christ hath taught us to pray unto God onely.

Ut aliter orare quàm docuit, non ignorantia sola fit, sed & culpa. Cyp. de orat. Dom.

And *Cyprian* saith, that *wee must pray with the heart rather then with the voyce, because God heares not so much the voyce as the heart.* Hee saith that *before prayer* (viz. in the Congregation) *the people were required*

Quia Deus non vocis, sed cordis auditor est. Nec admonendus est clamoribus, qui cogitationes hominum videt. Cyp. Ibid.

Ideo & sacerdos ante orationem præfatione præmiſſa, parat fratrum mentes dicendo Sursum corda ; ut dum responderet plebs, Habemus ad Dominum, admonetur nihil aliud se, quam Dominum cogitare debere. *Cyp. Ibid.* Quomodo te audiri à Deo postulas, cum te ipse non audias ? *Ibid.*

to lift up their hearts ; and they used to answer, wee lift them up unto the Lord ; whereby they were admonished to thinke of nothing but the Lord when they prayed. And taxing those that pray negligently, How dost thou request that God should heare thee, when as thou dost not hear thy self ?

And some of the ancients have proved Christ to be God by this very argument that hee is called upon, and prayed unto.

** Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur homo in orationibus mediator invocatur, cum invocatio hominis ad præstandam salutem inefficax judicetur ? Novat. de Trinit. cap. 14.* † De Trinitate disputaturus Novatianus Presbyter Romanus sub S. Fabiano Papa, quantum apparet, adhuc Catholicus, &c. *Pamelin argum. lib. de Trinit.*

*If Christ be onely man (saith * Novatian) Why is man called upon in prayers as Mediator, seeing that the invocation of a man is judged inefficall to afford salvation ? Though Novatian in some things proved an Heretike, yet was hee not an Heretike in this : yea † Pamelius a Romanist tells us, that he wrote this whiles, for any thing that appeares, he was a Catholik.*

Novat. de Trinit. cap. 14. † De Trinitate disputaturus Novatianus Presbyter Romanus sub S. Fabiano Papa, quantum apparet, adhuc Catholicus, &c. *Pamelin argum. lib. de Trinit.*

This also that great hammer of the Arians, *Athanasius*, proved Christ to be consubstantiall to the Father, by that of the Apostle, *1 Theſſ. 3. 11. Now God himselfe, and our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ direct our way unto you.*

Neque enim quispiam precatur accipere à Deo, & ab Angelis, aut ab ullis rebus creatis. Neque quisquam hanc verborum formam concepit, Deo tibi Deus, & Angelus ; sed contra à Patre, & Filio propter unitatem uniformemque rationem dandi. *Athanasius, orat. 4. contra Arianos.*

For (saith hee) none would pray to receive from God and from the Angels, or from any of the creatures. Neither would any speake in this manner, God and an Angel give unto thee. But the Apostle askes of the Father and of the Son, because of the unity of their nature, and the uniforme manner of their giving.

Non aliquem Angelorum cratorum, & qui naturâ Angeli erant in unum copulavit cum Creatore Deo ; neque omisso nutritio suo Deo, ab Angelo benedictionem suis nepotibus postulavit : sed quia discretè locutus est de Angelo, qui illum ab omnibus malis liberaverat, satis præ se tulit non ex

And immediately after hee answers that place which the Marquesse alledgeth, viz. *Gen. 48. 16. The Angel that redeemed me from all evill, blesse the Lads, saying, Jacob did not comple any of the created and naturall Angels with God the Creatour ; neither did he omit God that nourished him, and desire*

a blessing for his nephewes from an Angell. But in that he spake expressly of the Angell that redeemed him from all evill, he shewed sufficiently, that it was none of the created Angells, but the Son of the Father, whom he in his prayers joyned with the Father, by whom God doth redeeme whom he pleaseth. For he knew him to be the * Angell of the Fathers great Counsell, neither did he in his words expresse any other but him that doth blesse, and redeeme from evill.

Austine also in his booke of true Religion, doth frequently asseert that religious worship belongs not unto Angells, but to God onely; and consequently that Angels are not to be prayed unto, Prayer and Invocation being (as *Bellarmine* confesseth) a singular kinde of adoration. That (saith * *Austine*) which the highest Angell doth worship, is also to be worshipped by the lowest man. — Let us believe that the best Angels and the most excellent Ministers of God desire this, that we together with themselves may worship only God, by whose contemplation they are blessed. — Therefore we honour them with love, not with service. — Rightly therefore is it written, that a man was forbidden by an Angell to worship him, and was required only to worship God, under whom the Angell was mans fellow-servant. — Behold I worship only God, &c. Which of the Angells sever doth love this God, I am sure doth also love me. — Therefore let Religion binde us onely to the Almighty God.

lamus Deum, cujus contemplatione beati sunt. — Quare honoramus eos charitate, non servitute. — Rectè itaque scribitur hominem ab Angelo prohibitum, ne se adoraret, sed unum Deum, sub quo ei esset & ille conservus. — Ecce unum Deum colo, &c. Quisquis Angelorum diligit hunc Deum, certus sum quòd etiam me diligit. — Religet ergo nos Religio uni omnipotenti Deo. *Aug. de verâ relig. cap. vii.*

creatis Angelis aliquem, sed Filium fuisse Patris, quem Patri in suis precibus confociavit, per quem Deus liberat quos vult. Hunc enim magni consilii Patris Angelum noverat, nec alium nisi illum ipsum, qui benedicit, & liberat ex malis, suis verbis expressit. *Athanas. Ibid.*

* So Christ is styled *Isai. 9.6.* according to the Greeke Translation.

Quarta de Invocatione, quæ est eximium genus adorationis. *Beitar. ord. dispur. de Eccles. Triumph.*

* Quod colit summus Angelus, id colendum etiam ab homine ultimo. — Hoc etiam ipsos optimos Angelos, & excellentissima Dei Ministeria velle credamus, ut unum cum ipsis co-

Now for the two places of Scripture, which the Marquesse objecteth, one of them is already answered from *Athanasius*. And the same answer also belongs to the other place, viz. *Hos. 12.4.* the Angell there spoken of is not a created Angell,

but God himselfe, as appeares by the words immediately going before v. 3. *He had power with God*; then followes v. 4. *yea he had power over the Angell, and prevailed; he wept also, and made supplications unto him.* This shewes that God and the Angell there mentioned are one and the same. This which the Prophet speaketh of *Jacobs* making supplications to the Angell, hath reference to that Gen. 32. 26. *I will not let thee go except thou blesse me,* as *Hierome* upon the place observeth. Now if *Jacob* would not desire a blessing for his Nephewes from a created Angell (and wee have seene that in the judgement of *Athanasius* hee would not) then surely neither was it such an Angell, of whom

Roboratus benedictionibus Angelis,
qui ipse est Deus. *Hieron. in Hos. 12.*

Angelos videtur postulare, ut pro eo
deprecetur, aut certe sanctos, ut pro
penitente orent. *Aug. in Job. 19. 21.*

Quod Augustinus exponit hic An-
gelos, aut sanctos invocari, allegori-
cum est. *Pined in Job 19. 21.*

Amicos nominat, quibuscum disputat.
Pined. Ibid.

he himselfe did seeke to be blessed. And *Hierome* upon the words of *Hosea* saith plainly that this angell is God. None of the Fathers are here alledged against us, but onely *Ausine*, whom I have shewed to testifie abundantly for us. That which hee saith in the place quoted, is that *Job* seemeth to desire the angels to intreat for him, or else some of the Saints. But *Pineda* a Jesuite doth not like this Exposition, but calles it allegoricall, and expoundes it (as it ought to be expounded) of those friends of *Job* that disputed with him. If our adversaries shall reply, that though *Ausine* did not rightly expound the words of *Job*, yet however hee shewed it to be his opinion, that the angels might be prayed unto. I answer, first *Ausine* here maketh as well against them, as against us. For he speakes as much of *Jobs* praying unto Saints, as unto angels: now our adversaries hold (as I shall shew more hereafter) that in those times before Christs comming the Saints were not to be prayed unto. Again, *Ausine* doth not say, that *Job* did pray either to Saints or angels, but that hee desired, yea onely that hee seemeth to have desired, that they might pray for him. Thirdly for one place, wherein *Ausine* speaketh obscurely and doubtfully for praying to angels, wee have many plaine and evident testimonies of this against it, as before I have shewed.

Lastly,

Lastly, *Aufine* himfelfe hath taught us to believe neither him, nor any other further then they accord with the Scriptures, but that we may, faving the reverence that is due unto them, difsent from them, when as they difsent from the truth. Thus he faith, he did in refpect of the writings of others, and fo he would have others to doe in refpect of his writings.

Neque enim quorumlibet difputationes, quamvis Catholicorum & laudatorum hominum, velut Scripturas

Canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat falvâ honorificentia, quæ illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum fcriptis improbare, atque refpuere, fi forte invenerimus quoddam aliter fenferim quam veritas habet, divino adjutorio vel ab aliis intellecta, vel à nobis. Talis ego fum in fcriptis aliorum; tales volo effe intellectores meorum. *Aug. Epist. 111.*

From the Angels the Marquels pafseth to the Saints decaff. Page 68.
ed, faying, *We hold that the Saints decaffed know what pafseth here on Earth; you fay they know not: We have Scripture for it. Luke 16. 29. Where Abraham knew that there were Moles and the Prophets bookes here on Earth, which he himfelfe had never feene when he was alive. The Fathers fay as much, Euseb. Ser. de Ann. S. Hiero. in Epist. Paule, S. Max. Ser. de Agnè.*

Anfw. That the Saints decaffed doe not know the particular affaires of men here on Earth, the Scripture doth teach us. *Job. 14. 21. His fonnes come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.* There *Job* fpeakes indefinitely of a man departed out of this life (whether he be Saint, or no Saint) and fheweth, that he doth not fo much as underftand the eftate of fuch as had moft neare relation unto him: and how then fhall we perfuade our felves, that hee doth underftand the eftate of others? And from thofe words *Ifai. 63. 16. Abraham is ignorant of us, and Israel knoweth us not, Aufine* doth inferre that the Dead are not acquainted with the affaires of the Living. If not our parents, (faith hee) what other dead perfons know what we doe, or fuffer? If fo great Patriarkes (*Abraham and Jacob*) knew not how it fared with thofe that did defcend from them, how doe the dead intermeddle in knowing and helping the affaires of thofe that are alive? For my part, I thinke that place of *Esay* not fo pertinent to the pur-

Si parentes non interfunt, qui funt alii mortuorum, qui noverunt quid agamus, quidve patiamur? Si tanti Patriarchæ quid erga populum ex ipfis procreatum ageretur, ignoraverunt, quomodo mortui vivorum rebus, atque actibus cognoscendis adjuvandique mifcetur? *Aug. de curâ pro mortuis. cap. 13.*

pose, but that the meaning of it is, that the people of Israel were so degenerate, that *Abraham* and *Israel* (if they knew what manner of persons they were) would not own them, not acknowledge them for their posterity: yet however, *Austine* sheweth what his Opinion was concerning those that are deceased, viz. that they are ignorant of the things that are done here; which is evident enough by those words of *Job* before cited.

*Bell. de Sanct.
beat. lib. 1. c. 20.*

Bellarmino sayes that *Gregory* upon the place doth answer, that naturally the dead know not how it fares with the living; but that yet the Saints, being glorified, doe see in God all things, *quæ nimirum ad ipsos pertinent*, viz. which doe belong unto them.

Sicut enim hi, qui adhuc viventes sunt, mortuorum animæ quo loco habeantur, ignorant: ita mortui vitam in carne viventium post eos qualiter disponatur, nesciunt. Greg. Moral. lib. 12. cap. 14.

Quod tamen de animabus sanctis sentiendum non est: quia quæ omnipotentis Dei claritatem vident, nullo modo credendum est, quia fors sit aliquid, quod ignorent. *Greg. Ibid.*

But *Gregory* upon those words of *Job* saith thus, *As they that are alive, know not where the soules of the dead are; so they that are dead, know not how they live that are after them.* Indeed hee addes presently after, *This yet is not to be thought of the holy soules, because they that see the brightnesse of Almighty God, are by no means to be thought ignorant of any thing besides.* Therefore he understands *Job* as speaking onely of such dead persons, as are unholy, whereas indeed *Job's* words are

indefinite, and indifferently to be understood of all that are dead, except by speciall Revelation any thing done here below be made known unto them. *Thou destroyest the hope of man, v. 19. viz. his hope of continuing here in this life. Thou changeest his countenance, and sendest him away, v. 20.* This holdes in respect of all: and then followes, *His former come to honour, and hee knoweth it not, &c. v. 21.* So that the coherence of the words shews, that they are meant generally of all that are deceased. And that which *Gregory* saith of the Saints, that seeing God, in him they see all things, *Bellarmino* himselfe (it seemes) did thinke too lavish, and therefore he limits it to all things which concerne them, or belong unto them. Which limitation doth indeed mar his market; for how doth it appeare, that it belongs unto the Saints departed to understand particular occurrences here below, and namely all the prayers that any shall make unto them? which is the scope, that they of the Church of *Rome* aime at,

when

when they speake of the Saints knowing things here on Earth : but of that more (God willing) hereafter. But for the Saints knowing our affaires, it was (it seemes) in the time of *Lombard* (above 1100 years after Christ) a point not much believed ;

For *Lombard* moving the question, saith onely this, *It is not incredible that the soules of the Saints enjoying the vision of God, doe understand humane and earthly affaires, so far as concernes their joy, and our helpe.* Hee doth not say, that this is certaine, but onely that it is not incredible. And

Bellarmine himselfe relating foure severall opinions about the manner how the Saints know things here upon Earth, of two of them, viz. that they know them by the relation of Angels, or by being after a sort every where present, hee saith plainly, that neither of them doth satisfie, and gives convincing Reasons for it.

And for the other two opinions, viz. that the Saints from the beginning of their blessednesse doe in God see all things that any way appertaine unto them : Or that God doth then reveale things unto the Saints, when any at any time doe pray unto them ; hee likes not the latter of these, because (hee saith) *If the Saints did needs a new revelation upon every occasion, the Church would not so boldly say unto all the Saints, pray for us, but would sometimes desire of God to reveale our prayers unto them : And for the other Opinion, which remaines, hee sayes no more but onely that it is probable.* So that wee see by our adversaries owne confession, they have no certainty of this, that the Saints in Heaven are particularly acquainted with things here on Earth. Some may say, that they are certaine that it is so, though they be uncertain how it comes to be so. I answer, indeed if the Scripture did affirme that so it is, then wee might and ought to be assured of it, though wee could not see why it is so. But the Scripture is

Non est incredibile animas sanctorum quæ in abscondito faciei dei veri luminis illustratione lærantur, in ipsius contemplatione ea, quæ foris aguntur, intelligere, quantum vel illis ad gaudium, vel nobis ad auxilium pertinet. Lomb. sens. lib. 4. dist. 45. lit. f.

De modo autem quo cognoscunt, quatuor sunt Doctorum sententiæ, &c. Bell. de Sanct. beat. lib. 1. cap. 20.

Sed neutra est sufficiens, &c. Bellarm. Ibid.

Si indigerent Sancti nova revelatione, Ecclesia non diceret ita audacter omnibus Sanctis, Orate pro nobis, sed peteret aliquando à Deo, ut eis revelaret preces nostras. Bellar. Ibid.

Estque probabilis hæc sententia. Bell. Ibid.

so farre from affirming it, that it denies it, as I have shewed ; and therefore they that maintaine it, must both answer the Scripture where it is denied, and also by Scripture prove the contrary assertion, which they neither doe, nor can doe. That place cited by the Marquesse, viz. Luke 16.29. is not of force to prove it. For 1. Some Romish Expositors, and namely

Dubium est, an hoc exemplum sit tantum parabola, &c. Fausen. Concord. cap. 97.

Si Historiam quis esse dixerit, & rei gestæ narrationem; necesse est tamen taceatur, non omnia sic contigisse ut narrantur. Certum est enim divitem in inferno non locutum esse linguâ, nec oculis corporalibus vidisse *Abraham*, &c. *Fausen. Ibid.*

Ita ut corporalia, quæ post hanc vitam commemorantur, sint allegorice & spiritaliter accipienda, sive sit nuda parabola, sive vera Historia. *Fausen. Ibid.*

Si autem exemplum hoc non Historia

esse dicatur, sed parabola tantum, facilius erit quæstionis explicatio. Dicit enim poterit hæc sic à Domino conficta esse, cum sic gesta non essent, tantum ad erudiendum & monendum vivos, ne suæ impenitentiae prætexant, quod de statu futuræ vitæ nihil unquam didicerint ex his, qui è futurâ vitâ redierunt.—Idcirco quò hanc cogitationem Dominus castigaret, proposuit hunc divitem orasse, ut *Abraham* ad fratres suos *Lazarum* mitteret, & vulgarem hanc hominum cogitationem exposuisset, ut sic *Abraham* cujus magna erat apud Judeos auctoritas, responsum subiceret quo talis cogitatio reprehenditur & confutatur.—Hic jam ergò *Abraham* hanc vulgi opinionem consultans respondit, Si *Mosen* & Prophetas non audium, &c. *Iam. Ibid.*

rich

rich man, desiring *Abraham* to send *Lazarus* to his Brethren, that so he might also bring in the answer of *Abraham*, who was of great authority among the Jewes, by which answer that conceit is reproved, and confuted. For *Abraham* confuting that opinion of the common sort of people answered, *If they heare not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they believe, although one should arise from the dead.* Thus then that place doth not evince, that *Abraham* knew that the Jewes had the writings of *Moses*, and of the Prophets. 2. Suppose that part of Scripture to be a History, and that *Abraham* did indeed know that the writings of *Moses* and the Prophets were upon the Earth, yet it doth not therefore follow that hee knew all the severall things done amongst men. What God would please to reveale, hee might know, but how much that is, who can tell? yea the Romanists themselves do hold that neither *Abraham*, nor any other, during the time of the old Testament, did understand the estate of men here alive. Although the ground of this opinion of theirs be not good, viz. because as then they did not enjoy the blessednesse of the life to come, yet however this is sufficient to extort from them this place of *Luke*, and to shew that they by their own principles can draw no argument from it for their Purpose. For the Fathers which the Marquesse alledgeth, I can onely looke into *Hierome*, as being destitute of both the other; But I have here, and continually almost cause to complaine of the Marquesse quotations, they being so wide, as here, and in many other places they are. For there are 14. Chapters of this booke of *Hierome*, that is mentioned, but in which of these Chapters any thing to the purpose is to be found, is not expressed, yet with much ado I finde that *Hierome* seemeth to suppose that *Paula* being dead knew this estate. But I finde in another place (viz. *Adversus Vigilantiam* cap. 2.) that *Hierome* makes the Saints departed to be every where, and by consequence to know what is done any where.

Responderi potest, Abrahamum Iſraelem, & alios Patres veteris Testamenti non cognovisse posteros suos viuentes, quia nondum beati erant, &c. Bellarm. de sanctis beatis lib. 1. cap. 20.

agnus ubique, ergo & hi, qui cum agno sunt, ubique esse credendi sunt. *Hierom. adversus Vigilantiam* cap. 2.

Sequitur agnum quocunque vadit Si

* Ad cognoscendas preces, quæ eodem tempore fiunt in diversissimis

But * *Bellarmino* likes not to build upon such a foundation, confessing that truly and properly to be every where, is a thing, that doth not belong either to the soules of men, or to the Angels.

locis, non sufficit celeritas, sed requiritur vera ubiquitas, quam nec Angelorum, nec hominum spiritibus convenire credimus. *Bell. de beatit. Sancti lib. 1. cap. 20.*

Page 68.

From the knowledge, which the Saints deceased are pretended to have of our affaires, the Marquess passeth to their praying for us. This hee proves by Revel. 5. 8. *The 24. Elders fell downe before the Lamb, having every one of them Harpes, and golden Vials, full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints.*

And by *Baruch 3. 4. O Lord Almighty, thou God of Israel, heare now the prayers of the dead Israelites.* Hee addes also the testimonies of *Aug. Ser. 15. de verb. Apostoli, Hilar. in Psal. 139. and Damas. de Fide l. 4. c. 16.*

Ans. That the Saints in Heaven do not pray for us in particular, appeares by what hath beene proved already, viz. that our particular affaires are not knowne unto them. That they pray for us in generall, Protestants doe not deny: about this wee doe not

Sancti orant pro nobis, saltem innere.] Neque de ista propositione contentionem ullam fovemus. Amos. advers. Bellar. de Invocat. Sanctor.

Bell. de Sancti. beat. lib. 1. cap. 20.

commend, saith *Amosius* against *Bellarmino*.

And *Bellarmino* himselfe cites the Apology of the Augustane Confession granting thus much, that the Saints in Heaven doe pray for the Church in generall. But for that place *Revel. 5. 8.* I see not how it makes for

the purpose. For neither doth it appeare, that the 24. Elders there mentioned, are the Saints departed; nor, if they be, is it said, that they pray for the Church here upon Earth. Indeede the Rhemists upon the place say, *Hereby it is plaine, that the Saints in Heaven offer up the prayers of faithfull and holy persons in Earth, &c.* And hence they infer, That the Protestants have no excuse of their error, That the Saints have no knowledge of our affaires, or desires. But there is no such thing, as they speake of, plaine by this place of Scripture, except (to use the Marquesses words) *it be margined with their own notes, send with their own meaning, and enlivened with their own private spirit.*

They take it for granted (as the Marquess also doth after them) that the Saints in Heaven are meant by the 24. Elders, and that the

Page 52.
and 53.

that the Saints after mentioned, are the Saints upon Earth, whereas the former of these is so farre from being evident, that their own Jesuite *Ribera* doch tell us, that *Concerning the 24 Elders the opinion of the Fathers, and of Expositors is so various, that the more one reader them, the more uncertaine he shall be.* And among other opinions hee saith that some by the 24. Elders understand the whole Church. This Exposition indeed he dislikes upon this ground, that the foure beasts spoken of, are not comprehended in the 24. Elders. But he enervates this reason himselfe, understanding by the 24. Elders the most eminent among the Saints in Heaven, and by the foure beasts the foure Evangelists, who yet are of the number of those eminent Saints; and so the foure beasts are also part of the 24 Elders, onely (hee saith) they are mentioned apart by themselves, as being one of that number, because besides the excellencie which is common to them with others, they have some excellency which is proper and peculiar to themselves. By the thred of his own Exposition it appeares, that his argument is of no force why the 24. Elders may not signifie the whole Church. And although hee make it to be without doubt, that the 24. Elders doe offer up the prayers of other Saints, viz. which are upon Earth, yet when it is said, that the 24. Elders had *golden Vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints,* Revels. 8. I see not but that by the Saints there may be understood the 24. Elders themselves as well as any others. If other Saints be meant, distinct from the 24 Elders, Master *Mider* Exposition seemes probable, that by the 24 Elders are meant Ministers, and by the foure beasts the rest of Gods people, and so here by the Saints, whose prayers are offered up by Ministers, who in the publicke Assemblies are the mouth of the people, and offer up their

M m 2

De viginti quatuor senioribus tam varia Patrum & Expositorum sententia est, ut quo magis leguntur, eò lector reddatur incertior. Ribera in Apoc. 4. 4.

Alii totam Ecclesiam, &c. Ibid.

Non esse totam Ecclesiam constat, quoniam quatuor animalia non numerantur in illis. — At si quatuor animalia sunt quatuor Evangelistæ; quomodo secernuntur à numero 24 Seniorum, cum ipsi maxime ad hunc numerum pertinere videantur, ut qui inter beatos omnes multum excellent? Respondedo non secerni ab illis, quasi ipsi inferiores sint, aut ad numerum illorum, aut ad illam dignitatem pertinere non possint, sed quod dignitate quoddam præterea emineant, cujus causa extra illum numerum constitui, & nominari debeant. Ribera ad Apoc. 4. 6.

Deinde ipsi offerunt orationes sanctorum, haud dubiam quin eorum, qui sunt in terrâ. Ribera ad Apoc. 4. 4.

Made on Revel.

4.

prayers

prayers unto God for them. But how ever it be, thus much may sufficiently appeare by what hath beene said, that the Romanists can evince nothing from this Scripture as to this point, that the Saints in Heaven doe understand the particular estate of men here upon Earth, and pray for them. For the other place alledged, viz. *Baruch* 3. 4. I give this answer, that the Booke is

Librum autem Baruch notarii ejus, qui apud Hebræos nec legitur, nec habetur, prætermisimus. *Hieron. præfat. in Jer.*

not Canonickall, the Jewes, to whom were committed the oracles of God (viz. the Scriptures of the old Testament) *Rom.* 3. 2. *Luke* 16. 29. not owning it, as is observed by *Hierome*, who therefore did let it passe,

as himselve testifieth.

For the Fathers that are cited, *Austine de verb. Apost. Ser.* 15. hath nothing, that I see, to the purpose. Neither hath

Sunt secundum Raphaellem ad Tobiam loquentem Angeli adstantes ante claritatem Dei, & orationes deprecantium ad Deum deferentes. *Hil. in Psal.* 129.

Sed neque defunt stare volentibus sanctorum custodiæ, neque angelorum munitiones. *Hilar. in Psal.* 124.

Hilary in *Psalm* 129. any thing about the Saints praying for us, but onely about the Angels carrying the prayers of men unto God, which hee fetcheth from the Booke of *Tobit*, but to that I have spoken before. Indeed in another place, viz. upon *Psalm* 124. (which *Bellarmino* produceth) hee saith that neither the guards of the Saints, nor the Munitions of Angels are wanting unto

us. But I see not how any more can be inferred from this, then that the Saints doe in generall pray for us, which wee doe not deny.

τὰς τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἡμῶν τὰς ἐντευχέας ποιεῖντες ὡς τιμῆον ; *Damasc. de Fide lib.* 4. c. 16.

Πᾶσα θεία ἀγαθὴ ἐκ τῶ πατρὸς τῶν φανῶν δι' αὐτῶν τοῖς ἀδυσάκλω πνεύματι ἀγίοι καὶ ἁγίοι. *Damasc. Ibid.*

Neither doe the words of *Damascen* in the place quoted import more then thus, when he saith that the Saints departed make intercessions for us, and that therefore they are to be honoured by us. This may well be understood of their praying in generall for us. A little before indeed hee hath that which doth not sound well, viz. that every good gift doth come downe from the Father of lights

by them (viz. the Saints departed) to those that aske in faith without doubting. The Scripture teacheth us no such thing concerning the Saints, but attributeth this honour unto Christ, that
by

by him we obtaine of God whatsoever is good and needfull for us. He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Rom.8. 32. But Damascene, though a man famous in his generation, yet is of no great antiquity, being (as Bellarmine computes) 731 years after Christ, and therefore his testimony is of the lesse force, besides that some of the Romanists, namely Sixtus Senensis doth note him as in some point of faith erroneous, viz. about the proceeding of the holy Ghost.

Bell. de Eccles.
Scriptor.

Sixt. Sen. Bibl.
li. 6. Annot. 187.

But at length the Marquesse comes to our praying to the Saints, that being the marke aimed at a long time. Wee hold (saith hee) that we may pray unto them; you not: we have Scripture for it, Luke 16.24. Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, &c. You bid us shew one prooffe for the lawfulness hereof, when here are two Saints prayed unto in one Verse. And though Dives were in Hell, yet Abraham in Heaven would not have expostulated with him so much, without an on nobis domine, if it had beene it selfe a thing not lawfull. You will say, it is a parable: yet a jury of ten Fathers, of the grand inquest, as Theophil. Tertull. Clem. Alex. S. Chrys. S. Ier. S. Amb. S. August. S. Greg. Euthym. and Ven. Beda, give their verdict, that it was a true History. But suppose it were a parable, yet every parable is either true in the persons named, or else may be true in some others. The holy Ghost tells us no lies, nor fables, nor speakes not to us in parables consisting either of impossibilities, or things improbable. Job 5.1. Call now, if there be any that will answer thee, and to which of the Saints wilt thou turne? It had been a frivolous thing in Eliphaz to have asked Job the question, if invocation of Saints had not beene the practice of that time. The Fathers affirme the same, S. Dionys. cap. 7. S. Athan. Ser. de Annunt. S. Basil. Orat. de 44. Martyr. S. Chrys. Hom. 66. ad Pop. S. Hierome prayed to Paula in Epitaph. S. Paula, S. Maximus to S. Agnes Ser. de S. Agnete, S. Bern. to our blessed Lady.

Page 69.

Ans. This point of praying to Saints, the Marquesse (it seemes) made great account of, in that he bestowed so many words about it: but the unlawfulness of this practice is cleare enough by that which I have said before about praying unto Angels. For I have demonstrated both by authority of Scrip-

tures, and also by testimony of Fathers, that prayer is to be made unto God onely. And if the Saints doe not know our affaires here below (as I have shewed that they doe not) then it must needs be absurd and irrationall to pray unto them. Yea, although we should but onely desire them to pray for us, as here we desire the prayers one of another. But whatever our Adversaries sometimes may pretend, yet they are farre from contenting themselves with this liberty, though it be more then is allowed them. Their praying unto the Saints, is a worshipping of them, as I have shewed before by their own confession. *Bellarmino* also tells us, that when they say, the Saints are onely to be requested to pray for us, they doe not meane but that we may say, *S. Peter have mercy on me, save me, open an entrance unto Heav'n for me: give me health of body, give me patience, courage, &c.* So that we understand it thus, *Save me, and have mercy on me by praying for me: give me this or that by thy prayers and merits.* But what is this, but to displace Christ, and to set up Saints in his roome?

Notandum,
cum dicimus,
non debere
peti à sanctis,
nisi ut orent
pro nobis, nos
non agere de
Verbis, sed de
sensu verbo-
rum. Nam
quantum ad
verba, licet dicere, *S. Petre miserere mei, salva me, aperi mihi aditum celi, item da mihi
sanitatem corporis, da patientiam, da mihi fortitudinem, &c.* dummodo intelligamus, salva
me, & miserere mei orando pro me, da mihi hoc & illud tuis precibus, & meritis. *Bellar.*
de sanct. beat. lib. 1. cap. 17.

Accipere sancti, non dedere coronas;
& de fortitudine fidelium exempla
nota sunt patientiæ, non dona
justitiæ. *Leo apud Cassand. consult. de
meris. & intercess. sanct.*

Their Pope *Leo* cited by their *Cassander*, concerning this same point, hath taught a better lesson, saying, *The Saints have received, not given crownes: and by the fortitude of Believers we have examples of patience, not gifts of righteousness.*

This *Cassander* cites, shewing how ill it suites with the Romish practice, which hee (although a Romanist) complaines of as too exorbitant. *Bellarmino* takes it very ill that *Calvine* sayes they pray unto the Virgin *Mary* to command her Sonne: with great indignation hee cries out, *Who of us doth say this? Why doth hee not prove it by some example?*

Dicit nos rogare Virginem, ut filium jubeat facere quod petimus. At quis nostrum hoc dicit? Cur non probat ullo exemplo? *Bellarmino de beat. sanct. lib. 1. cap. 16.*

But

from me. And so all along throughout all the *Psalms* it runs after this manner. May we not now most justly apply that to the Romanists, which *Ambrose* spake of the Heathens? *They thinke themselves not guilty, who give the honour of Gods Name to the creature, and leaving the Lord adore their fellow-servants; as if there were any thing more, that might be reserved for God.*

Et isti se non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deferunt creaturæ, & relicto Domino conservos adorant, quasi sit aliquid plus, quod reservetur Deo. *Ambr. in Rom. 22.*

Now for the Marquesses proofes, I marvell hee should stand so much upon that in *Luke 16.24.* For 1. *Chemnitius* sayes well, *Wee will not learne how to pray, of the damned, whom God hath cast off, and who are in eternall despaire.*

Non igitur à damnatis, qui à Deo abjecti, & in eternâ desperatione sunt, discemus veram invocationem. *Chemnit. in Exam.*

Orent igitur cum divite illo, qui ita exaudiri, & juvari volunt. *Ibid.*

And againe, *Let them pray as that rich man did, who would be heard, and helped as he was.*

2. Whereas the Marquess bringeth in a jury of ten Fathers, to prove that this Scripture is no Parable, but a History, why should wee be any more moved in this case with their verdict, then *Iansenius* a Romanist was, who (as I have shewed before) thought it more probable, that it is no History, but a Parable: or at least a History related after a parabolically

Παραβολὴ γὰρ καὶ τὸ τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἔχοντες ἱγὺς ἀπορίᾳς ἀν' αὐτοῦ, πρὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡδὴ γεγορῶς. *Theophylact. in Luke 16.*

ἔδωκε γὰρ ἔτε τοῖς δικαίοις τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀμαρτανόις τῶν ἐναντίων ἡ ἀποκρίσις. *Theophy. Ibid.*

manner? *Theophylact* also saith expressly that it is a Parable, and censures them as void of understanding, who take it for a History. His reason, I grant, is not good, viz. that as yet neither the just, nor the unjust doe receive their reward. And yet that assertion of his also is advantageous unto us in this point. For our Adversaries hold (as hath beene noted before) that therefore in the time of the old Testament

there was no praying to the Saints departed, because the Saints then (as they say) were not in blisse, and so could not heare the prayers that should be made unto them. Now *Theophylact* held, that the Saints in the time of the new Testament are not in blisse untill the last judgement, and the same was the opinion of many other Fathers. I know *Bellarmino* doth indeavour to

Bell de Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 40. §.

free

both *Theophylact*, and the rest, interpreting them as if they meant onely in respect of full and perfect bliss both in soule and body. But others of the Roman Church doe confesse, that it was their opinion, that the soules of the righteous doe not enjoy the beatificall vision untill the day of judgement. *Sixtus Senensis* doth cite *Irenaeus*, *Iustine Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Chrysostome*, *Lactantius*, *Ambrose*, *Austine*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, *Bernard*, and others, as being of this opinion: and therefore by our adversaries, owne principles they could not rightly hold the Invo- cation of Saints deceased. But to returne to that Scripture,

Sixt. Sen. Bibl.
l.6. Annot. 345.

Luke 16. *Iustine Martyr* (as hee is cited by *Bellarmino*,) denies that it is a true History. *Chrysostome* also saith plainly that it is a Parable, *Hom. 1. de Lazaro*. And yet hee is one of the Fathers, whom the Marquesse alledgeth to the contrary. I know not what

Justinus quæst. 60. ex iis, quas Gentes Christianis opponunt, dicit narrationem de divite & Lazaro non esse veram Historiam. *Beil. de Sanct. beat. lib. 1. cap. 1.*

that meaneth, which the Marquesse saith, *every parable is either true in the persons named, or else may be true in some others*. For we do not finde persons named in any parable besides this; which

is the maine, if not onely argument which is used to prove it a History rather then a Parable: though *Iansenius* did not thinke this to be a convincing argument; and he shews two reasons why the poore man was named, and not the rich, viz. 1. To teach us that God regards the poore that are righteous, more then the rich that are wicked. 2. Because when one is commended, it is meete to name him, but not so when one is condemned. And both these reasons (hee saith) stand good, whether this narration be onely a Parable, or a History. It is certaine, *the holy Ghost tells no lies, nor fables, &c.* Parables are not false, nor fabulous, yet * *Theophylact* saith well, *We must not take all things that are spoken in Parables, as Lawes and Canons.*

Narratio magis quam parabola videtur, quando etiam nomen exprimitur. *Amb. in Luc. 8. cap. 16.*

Nomen proprium ipsius Lazari arguit esse Historiam, quamvis non efficaciter, ut infra patebit. *Jans. Concord. cap. 97.*

Atque utraque hæc ratio nominati mendici conveniens est, sive exemplum hoc sit nuda parabola, sive etiam Historia. *Jam. Ibid.*

ἡ βολαὴ λεγόμενα ὡς νόμοις καὶ κανόνας παραλαμβάνειν. Theophylact. ad Joh. 3. page 410. Edit. Rom.

* ὅτι πάντα
τὰ ἐν παρα-

Tutissimum est, quod sapē moneo,
non nimis pressē tractandas esse pa-
rabolas: frangi sapē tractando; soe-
reque hic accidere, quod proverbio
dici solet, ut qui nimium emugit,
sanguinem eliciat. *Maldon. ad Luc.*
19. 22.

So *Maldonate* thought meete often to
admonish this, as a thing most safe, that
Parables are not to be handled too strictly;
that they are often broken by handling;
and that heve that doth happen, which is
said in the proverbe, *the too much wringing of
the nose bringeth forth blood.*

The other place, *viz. Job 5. 1.* is very inconveniently allego-
ed by the Marquesse for invocation of Saints deceased. *Belar-*
mine was more wary in citing it onely to prove, that Angels,
whom hee there

Indicant (hæc verba) tunc fuisse
consuetudinem invocandi patrocinii-
um sanctorum Angelorum. *Bell. de
sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 19.*

Ante Christi adventum, sancti qui
moriebantur, non intrabant in cælum,
nec deum videbant, &c. ideo non fuit
consuetum, ut diceretur, S. Abraham
ora pro me. *Bell. ibid.*

These words (saith he) *show, that it was the
custome then to call upon the holy Angels for
their patronage.* But to say (as the Mar-
quesse doth) that it appears by these words,
that they used then to call upon the Saints
departed, is contrary to the tenet of the
Romanists, who hold, that during the time
of the old Testament praying unto the de-

ceased Saints was not in use, because then the Saints that de-
parted out of this life (as they hold) did not goe to Heaven,
nor enjoy happinesse. But the truth is, those words *Job 5. 1. Call
now, &c. and to which of the Saints wilt thou turne?* make neither
for the invocation of Saints, nor of Angels, the meaning of
Eliphaz being onely to convince *Job* that none is punished as he
was except he were wicked; and therefore he bids him shew any
of the Saints, if hee could, that was so punished as hee was.
For this was the error of *Eliphaz* and the other two friends of
Job, that they thought *Job* could not be a godly man, because
God did so afflict him. Therefore God said his Anger was
kindled against them, because they had not spoken of him the
thing that was right. *Job. 42. 7.* For the Fathers, which are here
objected, the first, *viz. Dionys.* is cited *cap. 7.* but of what?
For hee wrote diverse Bookes. But his testimony is of little
worth, it being uncertaine who hee was, and when hee lived,
and this being evident to all that have any the least taste of him,
that hee was not (as is pretended) that *Dionysius* that is men-
tioned *Acts 17. 34.* which his fullian and bombast stile doth
suffi-

sufficiently declare. The next is *Athanasius*; but I finde no such peece as *Ser. de Annunt.* either in his workes, as they are extant both in Greeke and Latine, nor in *Bellarmines* Index or Catalogue of them, which he hath in his Booke of Ecclesiasticall writers; If perhaps the Marquesse meant * *Ser. de Sanctissimâ Deiparâ*, *Bellarmines* in that same booke censures it as not belonging to *Athanasius*, but to some other long after his time, and in some thing (as it seemes) not very sound. *Basil* I have not to peruse, nor *Maximus*. * *Chrysostome* in the place quoted, viz. *Hom. 66. de Pop. Antioch.* doth indeed seeme to speake for pray-

ing unto Saints to pray for us. But wee must remember how hee is reckoned among them, who held that the Saints departed are not yet in glory, and therefore if the Romanists will have him speake agreeably to this position, they must not have him for a patron in this cause touching the invocation of Saints. And upon the same ground must they also let goe *Bernard*, who is likewise noted for the same opinion; though the truth is, hee lived in very corrupt times, and therefore it is no marvell if hee did draw some druggs; it is indeed a marvell, that hee was not more corrupted and infected then he was. There remains onely *Hierome*, who in the end of his

Epitaph or Funerall Oration concerning *Paula*, addresseth his speech unto her, bidding her farewell, and helpe him with her prayers. But 1. I have shewed before, that *Bellarmines* doth overthrow the foundation that *Hierome* buildes upon, viz. that the Saints departed are every where, and so can heare and understand whatsoever any stand in need of, and desire of them; which *Bellarmines* confesseth to be incompatible to any meeke creature, as indeed it is, this being a property that belongs unto God only. 2. When the Fathers sometimes speak in that manner to the Saints deceased, their speeches proceeded rather from affection then from judgement, and are *Rhetoricall* rather then *Theologicall* expressions. As appears by that of *Gregory Nazianzen*, who in his first Oration

* That I finde to be it, by Bell. de Sanct. beat. lib. 1. cap. 19.

* Sicut sanctis supplicaturus, ut pro se apud Deum intercedant. *Chrysost.* loc. cit.

He lived 1130 years after Christ. Bell. de Eccles. Script.

Vale, O Paula, & cultoris tui ultimam sententiam orationibus juva. Fides & opera tua Christo te sociant, praesens quod postulas facilius impetrabis. *Hieron. in Epitaph. Paul. in fine.*

* Δὲν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Κοινοῦντες. *Nazianz. in Julian. orat. 1. circa initium.*

against Julian speaks thus unto Constantine, who was then dead,
*And heare O thou soule of the great Constantine, if thou hast any
 sense (or understanding) of these things.*

Ἰωαννης ὁ ἁγίου, ἀλλὶ οὐκ, ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπο-
 κλῆσις τοῦ ἁγίου ἡμεῶν. Scho-
 liaft. Ibid.

Where the Greeke Scholiast notes that
 Nazianzen did imitate *Iſocrates* a Heathen
 Oratour; *This is spoken* (saith hee) *in imi-
 tation of Iſocrates, as if he should say, If thou
 hast any power to heare the things that are here spoken. And ob-
 serve how Nazianzen (whom Hierome calleth his Master)*

Gregorius Nazianzenus præceptor
 meus. Hieron. Catal. Scriptor. Eccle-
 siast.

Honorandi sunt propter imitationem,
 non adorandi propter religionem.
 Aug. de verâ relig. cap. 55.

Uni Deo & Martyrum, & nostro,
 sacrificium immolamus; ad quod fac-
 rificium, sicut homines Dei, qui
 mundum in ejus confessione vicerunt,
 suo loco & ordine nominantur, non
 tamen à sacerdote, qui sacrificat, in-
 vocantur. Aug. de Civit. Dei lib. 22.
 cap. 10.

spake doubtfully, making it a question
 whether the Saints departed doe un-
 derstand things here upon Earth. 3.
Ansine (who lived in the same time
 with *Hierome*) in his booke of *true Religion*
 speaking of the Saints departed saith plain-
 ly, *They are to be honoured for imitation, but
 not to be worshipped for Religion.* And in the
 last booke of that famous worke intituled
Of the City of God, in the tenth Chapter of
 it, speaking of the Martyrs, hee saith, that
 in the celebration of the Eucharist they
 were mentioned in their place and order
 (viz. to praise God for them, and to stir
 up others to the imitation of them) but

yet that they were not invocated, and that no prayers were put
 up unto them. This may suffice to shew how farre in this
 point they of the Roman Church are departed both from the
 Rule of Gods Word, and also from the judgement and practice
 of the ancient Fathers.

Page 69.

We hold (saith the Marquesse) *Confirmation necessary; you
 not: We have Scripture for it, Acts 8. 14. Peter and John prayed
 for them that they might receive the holy Ghost (for as yet he was
 false upon none of them, onely they were baptized in the Name of
 the Lord Jesus) then laid they their hands on them, and they re-
 ceived the holy Ghost. Where we see the holy Ghost was given in
 Confirmation, which was not given in Baptisme. Also Heb. 6. 1.
 Therefore leaving the principles of the Doctrine of Christ, let us
 goe on unto perfection, not laying against the foundation of Repen-
 tance*

rance from dead Workes, and of Faith toward God, of Baptisme, and of laying on of hands. The Fathers affirme the same, Tertul. de Resur. S. Pacian. de Bapt. S. Amb. de sacr. S. Hierome contra Lucif. S. Cyr. l. 2. Ep. 1. speaking both of Baptisme and Confirmation saith, Then they may be sanctified and be the sons of God, if they be borne in both Sacraments.

Answer. Concerning Confirmation, the Romanists make it a Sacrament properly so called, of the same nature with Baptisme, and the Lords Supper. The matter of this Sacrament they make to be a certaine Ointment compounded after a speciall manner, and consecrated by a Bishop, wherewith the person to be confirmed, is anointed in the forehead in the forme of a crosse. The forme of the Sacrament they make to consist in these words, *I signe thee with the signe of the Crosse, and confirme thee with the Chrisme (or ointment) of salvation, in the Name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost.* The effect of this Sacrament they say is to confer true sanctifying grace, and that more abundantly then Baptisme doth in respect of the strengthening of the soule against the assaults of Satan. Now this Confirmation Protestants deny to be a Sacrament, as having no institution, nor any ground for it in the Scripture. The Author of the Treatise intituled *De unctione Chrifti*, who goes under the Name of *Cyprian*, but appears to have been some other, shewes that this anointing, which they use in confirmation, was taken up in imitation of that anointing which was used in the time of the Law.

Bonaventure also (who lived betwixt 1200 and 1300 yeares after Christ) held that Confirmation was neither dispensed, nor instituted by Christ.

And if it were not of Christs instituting, it can be no Sacrament properly so called, onely Christ (as the Councell of Trents Catechisme doth acknowledge) being the Author and Ordainer of every Sacrament.

Bell. de Confir.
lib. 2. cap. 8. 9.
9, 10, & 11.

Nec tamen cessantibus his, quæ ritu antiquo inoleverant, cum jam in populo Christiano circumcisio videretur damnabilis, & sacrificia idololatricæ imputarentur, unctionis mysterium Religio Christiana contempsit, &c.

Credo quòd illud Sacramentum Christus nec dispensavit, nec instituit. Bona. in scil. l. 4. dist. 7. art. 1. quest. 1. Et quest. 2. Christus hoc sacramentum non instituit.

Patet unum eundemque Deum in Christo justificationis, & Sacramentorum auctorem agnoscendum esse. — Perspicitur Sacramenta à Deo ipso per Christum instituta esse. Catechis. Trident. de Sacram.

Concil. Trid.
Sess. 7. can. 1.

And therefore the Council of *Trent* denounceth *Anathema* against all those that shall deny any of the Sacraments to have been of Christs institution.

For that *Acts* 8. 14. 17. which the Marquesse alledgeth, it is nothing to their *Confirmation*. For 1. There was laying on of hands, but no anointing with *Chrisme*, nor signing with the signe of the Crosse. 2. The giving of the holy Ghost there spoken of, was in respect of some extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghost, as speaking with strange Tongues, &c. as *Cajetan* himselfe upon

Accepisse eos Sp. S. in effecta sensibili
(puta locutione linguarum) restantur
subiuncta, quod Simon qui fuerat
Magus, viderit Spiritum S. datum per
impositionem manuum. *Cajet. ad. loc.*
Bell. de Confir. lib. 2. cap. 2.

the place observeth, and he solidly proveth it by this, that *Simon Magus* saw that the holy Ghost was given by the laying on of the handes of the Apostles. Besides, *Acts* 19. 6. (which place *Bellarmino* doth joyne with the other) it is expressly said, When

Paul had laid his hands upon them, the holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with Tongues, and prophesied. That therefore, which the Scripture speakes of the Apostles laying handes on some that had beene Baptized, and conferring the holy Ghost upon them, is far from proving that the Apostles did administer the Sacrament of *Confirmation*, there being neither the matter,

Nec materiam, nec formam Apostoli
disponserunt. *Bonav. lib. 4. dist. 7.*
art. 1. quæst. 2.

nor the forme, nor the effect of that pretended Sacrament. *Bonaventure* saith plainly, The Apostles did dispense neither the matter, nor the forme. And for the effect, we have

had already *Cajetans* Confession, viz. that the effect of the Apostles laying on of their hands was a sensible giving of the holy Ghost, and therefore not that which they make the effect of *Confirmation*. For the other place of Scripture, viz. *Heb. 6. 2.* what reason is there why by laying on of hands there mentioned, should be meant the Sacrament of *Confirmation*, which they will have to be administered with an ointment made of Oile and Balsome; whereas that Scripture speakes of no anointing? why may not that laying on of hands be the same with that, *1 Tim. 5. 22.* Lay hands suddenly on no man? viz. the laying on of hands used in the ordination of Ministers: which also wee read of *1 Tim. 4. 14.* and *2 Tim. 1. 6.* Or that laying on of hands, which is mentioned *Acts 8.* and *19.* whereby (as hath beene shewed)

shewed) the extraordinary and sensible gifts of the holy Ghost were conferred upon Believers? Thus * *Theophylact* upon the place expounds it, of laying on of hands, whereby they received the holy Ghost so as to foretell things to come, and to worke miracles. † *Cajetan* also understands it in like manner, of that laying on of hands, which was peculiar to those Primitive Christians.

* Impositio-
nis quoque
manuum, Quā
seil. & Spi-
ritum S. acci-
piebant, ejus
gratiā & futu-
ra prædicere,

& miracula ederent. *Theophyl.* ad loc. † Et hoc ad prima fidei fundamenta in primiti-
vā Ecclesiā spectabat. *Cajet.* ad loc.

For the Fathers alledged, it is granted, that the Fathers doe often speake of anointing, and that they speake of it as of a Sacrament. But diverse things are to be considered;

1. That the word *Sacrament* is by an-
cient Writers taken very largely, *Bellarmino*
confesseth that in the vulgar Latine Tran-
slation of the Scriptures the word is used of
many things that by the consent of all are
no Sacraments properly so called.

Invenimus nomen Sacramenti in
Scripturis tribui multis rebus, quæ
omniū consensu non sunt Sacramenta,
de quolibet nunc agimus. *Bell. de effect.*
sacram. l. 2. c. 24.

So *Cassander* saith that besides those seven
which the Church of *Rome* accounteth Sa-
craments, there are some other things used
among them, which by a more large accep-
tion of the word are sometimes called Sa-
craments. And that of those seven Sacra-
ments it is certaine the Schoolemen them-
selves did not thinke them all to be alike
properly called Sacraments. And he in-
stanceth in this very Sacrament of confir-
mation, shewing that some of the School-
men (namely *Halvet*) did not take it for a Sacrament of like
nature with Baptisme.

Et extra hunc numerum quædam sunt
in Ecclesiā celebrata signa; quæ &
ipsa latioris vocis notione Sacramenta
nonnunquam dicuntur. Et de his
quoque septem Sacramentis certum
est, ne ipsos quidem Scholasticos exi-
stimasse omnia ea æquè propriè Sa-
cramenta vocari. Nam et de confir-
matione quidam scripserunt, gratiam
confirmationis non esse univocè
gratiam cum illā, &c. *Cassand. Con-*
sult. artic. 13.

The same Author tells us, that one shall
hardly finde any before *Peter Lombard*
(who was 1145 yeares after *CHRIST*)
that did set downe a certaine and determi-
nate number of the Sacraments.

Nec temerè quenquam reperias ante
Pet. Lombardum, qui certum ali-
quem & definitum numerum Sacra-
mentorum statuerunt. *Cassand. Ibid.*

But

Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia à Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, aut esse plura, vel pauciora quàm septem, viz. Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, Extremam Unctionem, Ordinem, & Marimonium: aut etiam aliquod horum non esse verè, & propriè sacramentum, anathema sit. *Concil. Trident. sess. 7. can. 1.*

But the Councell of Trent hath decreed, *If any shall say, that the Sacraments of the new Testament were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; or that they are either more or lesse then seven, viz. Baptisme, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme unction, Order, and Marriage; or that any of these is not a Sacrament truly and properly so called, let him be anathema.* We may see therefore of what small standing the present Roman faith is.

τὸ ἐλάει τὴν χεῖριν τίς λόγος γὰρ γεγραμμένον ἐστὶν αὐτῷ; *Basil de Spir. S. cap. 37.*

2. Some of the Fathers doe expressly tells us, that the anointing, which they used, hath no foundation in the Scripture. *Basil* speaking of it, asks, *What written word hath taught it?* And so *Bellarmino* confesseth that there is no institution of it in the Scripture, and that they have it onely by Tradition, which yet hee saith is most certaine, and no lesse to be believed then the written word it selfe. But we are bidden goe to the Law, and to the Testimony; and are told, that if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. *Isai. 8. 20.*

3. The Fathers so peake of their anointing, as that they seeme to make it onely an Appendix of Baptisme. *Wee came to the water; thou wentest in* (saith *Ambrose*) then presently hee addes, *Thou wast anointed as a wrestler.*

Exinde egressi de lavacro perungimur benedictâ unctione *Tertull. de Baptif. c. 8.*

Pamel. Annot. in Tertull. Bellarm. de Confim. lib. 2. cap. 6.

Tunc enim demùm plenè sanctificari, & esse filii Dei possunt, si sacramento utroque nascantur. *Cyprian. lib. 2. Epist. 1. sive edit. Pamel. Epist. 71.*

So *Tertullian*, Being come out of that laver wee are anointed with the blessed anointing.

I know *Pamelius* makes that anointing there spoken of by *Tertullian* distinct from that used in Confirmation: but *Bellarmino* cites those words as meant of confirmation.

So those very words of *Cyprian*, which the *Marquesse* citeth, *Then they bee fully sanctified, and be the Sonnes of God, if they be borne of both Sacramments; those very words,*

wordes, I say, doe argue that *Cyprian* though he seeme to speak of two Sacraments, yet indeed accounted them but one Sacrament, in that he makes one and the same effect of both, *viz.* to be borne, whereas they of *Rome* make birth onely the effect of Baptisme, and strength the effect of Confirmation. Neither doth it follow that in *Cyprians* judgement they are two distinct Sacraments, because hee saith both Sacraments. For so he might speak in respect of two severall signes, though both used in one and the same Sacrament; Even as *Rabanus* calleth the body and blood of Christ two Sacraments; he means the consecrated bread and wine, which though they make but one Sacrament, yet because they are two sacramentall signes, he calles them two Sacraments.

4. Whereas the Fathers used to adde Confirmation presently after Baptisme, whether it were one of years, or an infant that was Baptized, as is acknowledged by *Bellarmino*, and other Romanists: now they thinke it not meete to Confirm children untill they come to the use of reason, and be able to confesse their faith. The Catechisme set forth by the decree of the councell of Trent, thinks it requisite, that children be either twelve years old, or at least seven years old before they be confirmed. And * *Durantus* tells us that a Synod at *Millan* did decree (and that, hee sayes, piously and religiously) That the Sacrament of Confirmation should be administred to none under seven years old. Thus have they (by their own confession) departed from the judgment and practice of the ancient Fathers themselves; and why then should they presse us with it?

differuntur alia duo Sacramenta, donec ad usum rationis pervenerint, Summâ ratione receptum est, quicquid Gerson censet, hoc sacramentum minime conferri antequam pueri rationis usum habuerint, & fidem suam confiteri possint. *Durant.* Ibid. Si duodecimus annus non expectandus videatur usque ad septimum certè hoc Sacramentum differre, maxime convenit. *Catech. Trident. de Confirmat.* * Pie & Religiosè Synodus Mediolanensis Anno 1565. decrevit, minori septennio Confirmationis sacramentum minime præbendum. *Durant.* ubi supra.

Corpus & sanguis Domini in duo Sacramenta secantur; quod apertè fit à *Rabano Cassiano. Consult. art. 13.*

Bell. de Confir. lib. 2. c. 7. Durant. de ritib. l. 1. c. 20.
Hoc tempore cum Baptizantur adulti, eodem die datur Baptismus, Confirmatio, & Eucharistia, ut veteres faciebant: sed cum Baptizantur infantes,

&c. *Bell. Ibid.*

After Confirmation the Marqueſſe commeth to communicating in one kinde, which they hold sufficient. And he saith that they have Scripture for it, *viz. Joh. 6. 51. (not 15.) If any man*

eat of this bread, hee shall live for ever. Whence hee inferre, If everlasting life be sufficient, then it is also sufficient to communicate under one kinde. So Acts 2.42. They continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and prayer. Where is no mention of the Cup, and yet they remained stedfast in the Apostles Doctrine. So also Luke 24.30,35. Where Christ communicated (hee saith) his two Disciples under one kinde. He addes, that *Austine, Theophylact*, and *Chrysostome* expound that place of the Sacrament.

Ans. The Scripture plainly shewes, that our Saviour instituting the Sacrament of his Supper, took, and blessed, and gave the Cup as well as the bread, and commanded that to be drunk as well as this to be eaten in remembrance of him. *Mat.* 26. *Mar.* 14. *Luke* 22. *1 Cor.* 11. And the Apostle tells us, that, *As oft as we eat this bread, and drinke the Cup of the Lord, we shew forth the Lords death till he come.* *1 Cor.* 11.26. And he bids *v.28. Let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drinke of that Cup.* Protestants therefore have good reason to hold it necessary to communicate in both kindes, and that it is utterly unlawfull to withhold the Cup from people, as

Hæc verba (Bibite ex hoc omnes)
dicuntur solis Apostolis, &c. *Bell. de*
Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 25.

they in the Church of Rome do. Our Adversaries thinke to put off those words of our Saviour, *Drinke ye all of this*, by saying that Christ spake so onely to the Apostles, and

therefore wee must not infer from them, that the common sort of people are to drinke of the Cup in the Sacrament. But 1. by this reason they may as well withhold the bread also from the people, and so deprive them of the whole sacrament. For when Christ gave the Bread, and bad *take, eat*, he spake onely to the Apostles, as well as when hee gave the cup, and bad that all should drinke of it. 2. The Apostle spake universally of all Christians, requiring that having examined themselves they should not onely eat of the bread, but drinke of the cup also. All antiquity is here on our side. *How doe we teach, or provoke them* (saith * *Cyprian*) *to shed their blood in the confession of*

* Quomodo
docemus, aut
provocamus
eos in confes-

sione nominis sanguinem suum fundere, si eis militaris Christi sanguinem denegamus? Aut quomodo ad Martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, si non eos prius ad bibendum in Ecclesia poculum Domini jure communicationis admittimus? *Cypr. Epist. 54. edit. Pamel.*

Christ

Christ, if we deny them the blood of Christ, when they are going to war-fare? Or how doe we make them meete for the Cup of Martyr-dome, if we do not first admit them to drinke the Lords Cup in the Church by the right of Communion? Thus spake Cyprian (and he

spake in the name of a whole Synod of Africk, as Pamelius observes) concerning such as though they had grossely offended, yet were judged meete to be admitted to the Sacrament because of a persecution, which was ready to come upon them, that

so they might be strengthened and prepared for it. This clearly shewes, that in Cyprians time all that did communicate at all, did communicate in both kinds, and not in one onely. So also

in another place, Considering (saith Cyprian) that they therefore daily drinke the cup of Christs Blood, that they also for Christ may shed their blood. There is a decree of Pope

Julian recorded by Gratian, wherein hee condemneth the practice of some, who used to give unto people the bread dipped for a full communion. This he saith is not consonant to the Gospell, where we finde that the bread and the cup were given severally each by it selfe. Much more, we may suppose, hee would have disliked that the bread alone, without any manner of parti-

cipation of the cup, should have been administred. Sure I am, the reason that hee alledgeth is every whit as much against this as against the other. So another Pope, viz. Gelasius (as the same Gratian relates) hearing of some, that would onely receive the bread, but not the Cup, bade that either they should receive the whole Sacrament, or no part of it, because the division of one and the same mystery (hee saith) cannot be without great Sacriledge.

neant; qui procudubio (quum nescio quâ superstitione docentur astringi) aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur. Quia divisio unius & ejusdem mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire, & Ibid. cap. Comperimus.

Id Episcoporum statum, totius Synodi nomine, nuntiat Cornelio Cyprianus; atque aded non tam ipsius Cypriani, quam Synodi Africanæ est hæc Epistola. Pamel. in argum. epist.

Considerantes idcirco se quotidie calicem sanguinis Christi bibere, ut possint & ipsi propter Christum sanguinem fundere. Cyp. epist. 56.

Illud verò, quòd pro complemento communionis intactam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex Evangelio testimonium receperunt, ubi Apostolis corpus suum commendavit & sanguinem. Scorum enim panis, & scorum calicis commendatio memoratur. De consecrat. dist. 2. cap. Cum omne.

*Comperimus quòd quidam sumptâ tantummodò corporis sacri portione, à calice sacra-
eruoris absti-*

Nec superfluit hæc, vel illa sumptio. Nam species panis ad carnem, & species vini ad animam refertur; cum vinum sit sacramentum sanguinis, in quo est sedes animæ; ideoque sumitur sub utraque specie, ut significetur quod utrumque Christus assumpsit, carnem & animam, & quod tam animæ quam corpori participatio valeat: unde si sub unâ tantum specie sumeretur, ad tuitionem alterius tantum valere significaretur. *Glossa Ibid.*

And whereas they speake of a concomitancy of the blood with the body, and so would have it sufficient to receive the bread onely, the glosse upon that canon is expressly against them, saying, that the bread hath reference onely to Christs Body, and the Wine onely to his Blood: and that therefore the Sacrament is received in both kindes to signifie that Christ assumed both Body and Soule, and that the participation of the Sacrament is available both to

Soule and Body. *Wherefore (it saith) if the Sacrament should be received onely in one kinde (in Bread onely) it would shew that it availes onely for the good of the one, viz. of the Body, and not for the good of the other, viz. of the Soule. Not to multiply testimonies, * Cassander in the very beginning of the Article, where in he treats of this point, ingenuously confesseth that the Universal Church of Christ to this day doth, and the Westerne or Roman Church for more then a thousand years after Christ did (especially in the solempne and ordinary dispensation of the Sacrament) exhibit both kindes, both Bread and Wine to all the members of Christ; which (he saith) is manifest by innumerable testimonies of ancient Writers both Greek and Latine.*

* De administratione sacri sancti Sacramenti Eucharistiæ sacris compertum est, Universalem Christi Ecclesiam in hunc usque diem, Occidentalem verò seu Romanam mille amplius à Christo annis in solenni præsertim & ordinariâ hujus sacramenti dispensatione utramque panis & vini speciem omnibus Christi membris exhibuisse: id quod ex innumeris veterum scriptorum tam Græcorum quam Latinorum testimoniis manifestum est. *Cassand. Consult. art. 22.*

Atque ut ita facerent inductos fuisse, primum instituto exemplo Christi, qui hoc sacramentum corporis & sanguinis sui duobus hisce panis & vini symbolis discipulis suis fidelium communicantium personam representantibus præbuit: tum quia in sacramento sanguinis peculiarem quandam virtutem & gratiam hoc vini symbolo significatam esse credebant: tum ab rationes mysticas hujus instituti, quæ à veteribus variè adducuntur,

And hee addes, that they were inducted hereunto, first by the institution and example of Christ, who did give this Sacrament of his Body and Blood under two signes, viz. Bread and Wine, unto his Disciples as representing the person of faithfull Communicants. And because in the Sacrament of the Blood they believed that a peculiar vertue and grace is signified. So also for mysticall reasons of this institution, which are diversly assigned by the ancient

ancient Writers: As to represent the memory of Christs Passion in the offering of his Body, and the shedding of his Blood, according to that of Paul, As oft as yee eat this Bread, and Drinke the cup of the Lord, yee shew forth the Lords death till hee come. Also to signifie full refreshing and nourishing. which consists in Meate and Drinke, as Christ saith, My flesh is meate indeed, and my Blood is Drinke indeed. Likewise to shew the redemption and preservation of Soule and Body, that Christs Body may be understood to be given for the salvation of our body, and his Blood for the salvation of our soule, which is in the Blood. And so also to signifie that Christ tooke both Body and Soule, that he might redeeme both.

And therefore hee saith, It is not without good cause, that very many good men, even of the Catholike profession, being conversant in the reading both of Divine and Ecclesiasticall Writers, doe most earnestly desire to partake of the Lords cup, and by all meanes strive that this saving Sacrament of Christs Blood together with the Sacrament of his Body may againe use to be received according to the ancient custome of the universall Church, which was continued for many Ages.

versati, & his quas supra diximus rationibus incitati, summo desiderio potiundi Dominici calicis incenduntur, omnibusque modis contendunt, ut hoc salutare sacramentum sanguinis Christi unâ cum sacramento corporis juxta veterem & multis sæculis perpetuatam universalis Ecclesiæ consuetudinem in usum reducatur, &c. Cassan. Ibid.

viz. ad representandam memoriam passionis Christi in oblatione corporis, & effusione sanguinis, juxta illud Pauli, Quotiescunque comederitis panem hunc, & calicem Domini biberitis, mortem Domini annuntiatis donec veniat. Item ad significandam integram refectiorem sive nutritionem, quæ cibo & potu constat, quomodo Christus inquit, Caro mea verè est cibus, & sanguis meus verè est potus. Item ad designandam redemptionem & tuitionem corporis & animæ, ut corpus pro salute corporis, & sanguis pro salute animæ, quæ in sanguine est, dari intelligatur. Ad significandum quoque Christum utramque naturam assumisse, corporis, viz. & animæ, ut utrumque redimeret. Cassan. Ibid.

Quare non temerè test, quodd optimi quique etiam Catholicæ professionis in divinorum & Ecclesiasticorum scriptorum lectione

For the Scriptures which the Marqueſſe alledgeth, the first of them, viz. Job. 6. 51. doth not concerne the Sacrament, which is not treated of in that Chapter, as I have noted before, and that according to the judgement of Jansenius a Romanist; to whom may be added diverse others of the Church of Rome, who (as Bellarmine confesseth) were of that opinion, viz. Bellar. de Euch. Bicl, Cusanus, Cajetan, Tapper, and Hesselius. And even

Bellarmino

Non est controversia an in toto capite agatur de Eucharistia : constat enim non ita esse. — Solū igitur questio de illis verbis, Panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est pro mundi vita, & de sequentibus ferē ad finem capitis. *Bellar. Ibid.*

life of the World; in those words, I say, and the rest that follow almost to the end of the Chapter, they say that our Saviour speaks of the Sacrament, but not in any of the former words of the Chapter. And if the Sacrament were spoken of in that Chapter, those words *v. 51. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever*, would not so much evince a sufficiency of communicating in one kinde, as the words a little after, *v. 53. Verely, verely I say unto you, Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drinke his Blood, you have no life in you*, would evince a necessity of communicating in both kindes. For if those words be understood of a Sacramentall eating and drinking, it cannot be avoided but that by those very words, as it is necessary to eate of the bread in the Sacrament, so is it to drinke of the cup also. For though by the forementioned com-
comitancy of the blood with the Body, they say that when one kinde onely, *viz.* bread is received, the Blood of Christ is drunk

Bellarmino himselfe, and others, who hold that the Sacrament is spoken of in *Job. 6.* yet hold it not to be spoken of till after those words, which the Marquess citeeth, in those words, which follow immediately after, *vers. 51. And the bread, which I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the*

life of the World; in those words, I say, and the rest that follow almost to the end of the Chapter, they say that our Saviour speaks of the Sacrament, but not in any of the former words of the Chapter. And if the Sacrament were spoken of in that Chapter, those words *v. 51. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever*, would not so much evince a sufficiency of communicating in one kinde, as the words a little after, *v. 53. Verely, verely I say unto you, Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drinke his Blood, you have no life in you*, would evince a necessity of communicating in both kindes. For if those words be understood of a Sacramentall eating and drinking, it cannot be avoided but that by those very words, as it is necessary to eate of the bread in the Sacrament, so is it to drinke of the cup also. For though by the forementioned com-
comitancy of the blood with the Body, they say that when one kinde onely, *viz.* bread is received, the Blood of Christ is drunk as well as his Body is eaten; yet (as *Jan-*

Verum non facili apparer, quomodo exterior illa sumptio possit dici bibitio. Manducatio enim recte dicitur, quia sumitur ibi aliquid per modum cibi: sed quomodo bibitio, cum nihil sumatur per modum potus? *Janfen. Concord. cap. 59.*

Cajet. in Ar. 2.
Janfen. Concord.
cap. 146.

Docet (Janfenius) voluisse Dominum hoc exemplo demonstrare fructū & utilitatem Eucharistie in una specie. *Bell. de Euchar. l. 4 c. 24.*

other two places, *viz. Acts 2.42. and Luke 24.30. by breaking of bread is meant the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. Cajetan* expounds the former place of ordinary bread, and the other place is expounded by *Janfenius* after the same manner.

Neither is it true that *Bellarmino* saith, that *Janfenius* teacheth that Christ by that example would shew the fruit and benefit
of

of the Sacrament received in one kinde. *Jansenius* doth not speake of receiving the Sacrament in one kinde (though I know hee did approve of it) but onely saith , that by the effect , that followed , the Lord would commend unto us the vertue of the Sacrament worthily received, to wit, that thereby our eyes are enlightened to know *Jesuu*.

And whereas *Austine*, and *Theophylact* are said to understand that in *Luke* 24. of the Sacrament, *Jansenius* tells us, that so many thinke , but that indeed they did rather make mention of the Sacrament, because it was (not here spoken of in *Luke*, but) mystically commended and insinuated by our Saviour.

jam impertuisse suis Eucharistiae Sacramentum : verum magis intelligendum eos hujus Sacramenti mentionem fecisse, quod illud hic à Domino mysticè fuerit commendatum & insinuarum. *Jansen. Ibid.*

Effectu hic subsecuto commendare fidelibus Dominus voluit vim Eucharistiae dignae suscepra, nempe quod per eam oculi hominum illuminantur ad cognitionem Jesu. *Jansen. Concord. cap. 146.*

Ex quibus
Theophylacti
& Augustini
sententiis apparet multis,
illos sensisse
Dominum

But suppose that the Sacrament were spoken of in those places, as probably it is in *Acts* 2. because *breaking of Bread* is there joyned with *Doctrine* and *Prayer*, yet there is no sufficient ground for communicating in one kinde. For the figure *Synecdoche*, whereby the part is put for the whole, is not usuall in the Scripture. Thus *Soule*, which is but a part of man, is put for man. *All the Soules that came with Jacob, &c.* that is, all the persons. *Gen.* 46. 26. So likewise *flesh* being a part of man, is used for man. *I will not feare what flesh can doe unto me. Psal.* 56. 4. that is, *what man can doe unto me*, as it is expressed, *vers.* 11. So whereas *David* saith, *In thy sight shall no man be justified, Psal.* 143. 2. *Paul* hath it, *There shall no flesh be justified in his sight. Rom.* 3. 20. Thus the whole celebration of the Sacrament may be termed *breaking of bread*, because that is one, and that an eminent part of it.

The Marquette goes on still concerning the same Sacrament, but so as in the Church of *Rome* it is changed into a Sacrifice.

We hold (saith hee) that *Christ* offered up unto his Father, in Page 70.
the Sacrifice of the Masse (as an expiation for the sinnes of the people) is a true and proper Sacrifice. This you deny : this we prove by Scripture, viz. *Mal.* 1. 11. From the rising of the Sunne to the going

going downe of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles: and in every place Incense shall be offered to my Name, and a pure offering. This could not be meant of the figurative offerings of the Jewes; because it was spoken of the Gentiles: neither can it be understood of the reall sacrifice of Christ upon the Crosse; because that was done but in one place, and at one time, and then, and there, not among the Gentiles neither. Which could be no other but the daily sacrifice of the Masse; which is, and ever was, from East, to West, a pure and daily sacrifice. Luke 22. 19. This is my body, which is given for you, not to you: therefore a sacrifice. The Fathers are of this opinion.

Ans. That Christ is offered up in the Eucharist a Sacrifice truly and properly so called, Protestants have good cause to deny. For the Eucharist is a Sacrament, to be received by us; not a sacrifice, to be offered unto God. Christ instituting the Sacrament, gave it to his Disciples; hee did not offer up himselfe as then unto his Father. The Scripture tells us, that *Wee* are sanctified through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all. Heb. 10. 10. And immediately after there it followes, that whereas the Leviticall Priests did often offer the same sacrifices, Christ having offered one Sacrifice for sinnes, for ever sate down on the right hand of God. And Heb. 9. 25, 26, 27, 28. the Apostle proves that Christ was not to be offered often, because his offering was his suffering; so that if hee should have been offered often, then he should also have suffered often. But (saith he) as it is appointed unto men to die once, &c. So Christ was once offered, &c. Bellarmine also averres, that un-

Ad verum sacrificium requiritur, ut id quod offertur Deo in sacrificium, planè destruat, id est, ita mutetur, ut definat esse id, quod antè erat. Bell. de Miss. lib. 1. cap. 2.

to a true sacrifice it is required, that the thing, which is offered unto God for a sacrifice, be plainly destroyed, that is, that it cease to be what it was before. So that if Christ bee offered up in the Eucharist, a true and proper Sa-

cifice, then hee must be destroyed, hee must cease to be what he was before. Whether or no it be blasphemy to affirme this of Christ, let all judge.

Hofiam, quæ offertur, occidi & mactari necesse est: Ergo si Christus singulis Missis sacrificatur, eum

Bellarmino indeed afterward indeavours to answer this argument; Let us see what he saith. The argument hee propounds thus,

The

The sacrifice, that is offered, must be slain. Therefore if Christ be sacrificed in every Masse, he must every moment in a thousand places be cruelly slain. To this hee answers thus, The sacrifice of the Masse is a most true sacrifice, and yet doth not require the killing of that which is offered. For killing is only required in the offering of a thing that hath life, and which is offered in the forme of a thing that hath life, as when Lambes, Calves, Birds, and the like are offered, whose destruction consists in death. But when the forme of the sacrifice is of a thing without life, as of Bread, Wine, Frankincense, and the like, killing cannot be required, but only such a consuming of the thing as is agreeable to it. In the Masse therefore Christ is indeed offered, who is a thing having life; and he is offered in the forme of a thing having life, in respect of representation, where onely a death representative is required, but not death indeed. But as he is a reall and properly so called sacrifice, he is offered in the forme of Bread and Wine, according to the order of Melchisedech, and therefore in the forme of a thing without life.--- Wherefore the consuming of this sacrifice ought not to be Killing, but Eating.

I have rehearsed his words at large, that so his answer may be seene at full. But though there be many wordes, which hee useth, yet it is somewhat hard to know what hee meaneth. Certainly this is a very strange kinde of sacrifice, that he speaketh of. Christ is offered up a sacrifice both in the forme of a thing that hath life, and also in the forme of a thing that is without life. And as hee is offered in the forme of a thing that hath life, hee is onely offered in respect of representation; but as he is offered in the forme of a thing that is without life, hee is really and indeed offered. So that Christ being offered in the forme of a thing that hath life, his death is represented; but he being offered in the forme of a thing that is without life, his

singulis momentis mille in locis crudeliter interfici oportet.---Respon-
do, Sacrificium Missæ esse verissimum sacrificium, & tamen non exigere veram hostiæ occisionem. Solum enim occisio requiritur in oblatione rei viventis, & quæ in formâ rei viventis offertur, ut cum offeruntur agni, vituli, aves, & similia, quorum destructio in morte consistit. At cum forma sacrificii est rei inanimæ, ut Panis, Vini, Thuris, & similium, non potest requiri occisio, sed solum consumptio rei illi conveniens. In Missâ igitur offertur quidem Christus, qui est res vivens, & offertur in formâ rei viventis, quantum ad representationem, ubi solum requiritur mors Representata, non autem mors reipsa: sed ut est sacrificium reale, & propriè dictum, offertur in formâ panis & vini, juxta ordinem Melchisedech, & proinde in formâ rei inanimæ.---
Quare consumptio hujus sacrificii non debet esse occisio, sed manducatio.
Bell. de Missâ. l. 1. c. 25.

death is not represented, and much lesse is it really executed, and yet Christ is so really and properly sacrificed. These things do but very unhand somely hang together. But whereas hee saith, that *the consuming of this sacrifice is the eating of it*, I demand, is Christs Body so eaten, as that it ceaseth to be what it was before? If it be not, (as certainly it is not, Christs Body being now glorified, and so free from all mutation) then is it not truly and properly sacrificed, *Bellarmino* himselfe telling us (as I have shewed before) that whatsoever is truly and properly sacrificed, is so destroyed, as that it ceaseth to be what it was before. To talke here of consuming the *Species* or forme of bread, so that it ceaseth to be what it was before, is nothing to the pur-

Corpus & sanguis Domini sunt id sacrificium, quod in Missa proprie offertur, & sacrificatur. Bell. de Miss. l. 1. c. 27.

pose; for they maintaine, that *the Body and Blood of the Lord are that sacrifice, which is properly offered and sacrificed in the Masse.*

And whereas *Bellarmino* also speaketh of Christs being offered in the forme of Bread and Wine, according to the Order of *Melchisedech*, I desire to know by whom *C H R I S T* is so offered? For either by himselfe, or by the Priest that saith Masse. Not by himselfe; for here we speak of Christs being offered in the Eucharist, which is not administered by Christ, hee being now in Heaven. Nor by the Priest on Earth, there being no Priest after the order of *Melchisedech*, but Christ only. *Psal. 110. 4. Heb. 7. 15.* &c. And thus indeed there is no Priest upon Earth, that is properly so called; and consequently there is no true and proper sacrifice to be offered. For every sacrifice presupposeth a Priest to offer it; and such as the sacrifice is, such also must the Priest be; hee must be a Priest properly so called, if it be a sacrifice properly so called. But there is no such Priest upon Earth; there being none (as I have shewed) after the order of *Melchisedech*; nor yet any after the order of *Aaron*, for that order is abolished, as all the Leviticall sacrifices are. And of any other order besides these we read not in the Scripture.

Sacrificium est oblatio, &c. quâ res aliqua sensibilis, & permanens ritu mystico consecratur, & transmutatur. Bell. de Miss lib. 1. cap. 12.

Again, in a sacrifice properly so called, it must be some sensible thing, (as our Adversaries themselves acknowledge) that is offered.

offered. But Christ is not sensible in the Eucharist; for by what sense is hee there discerned? And therefore neither is hee there truly and properly sacrificed. Neither was this Doctrine (*viz.* that Christ is properly sacrificed in the Eucharist) received in the Church of *Rome* for more then 1100 years after Christ, as appears by the Master of the Sentences, * *Peter Lombard*, who propounds the question, *Whether that which the Priest doth, be properly a sacrifice, and whether Christ be sacrificed daily, or were only once sacrificed.* And to this hee answers that, *that which is offered and consecrated by the Priest, is called a sacrifice, and an offering, because it is a memoriall, and representation of the true sacrifice, and holy immolation, that was made in the Altar of the Crosse. And Christ died once on the crosse, and was there sacrificed in himselfe; but he is daily sacrificed in the Sacrament, because in the Sacrament there is a remembrance of that which was done once.*

* Post hæc quæritur, si quod gerit sacerdos, propriè dicatur sacrificium vel immolatio, & si Christus quotidie immoletur, vel semel tantum immolatus sit. Ad hoc breviter dici potest,

illud quod offertur & consecratur à sacerdote, vocari sacrificium & oblationem, quia memoria est & representatio veri sacrificii, & sanctæ immolationis factæ in arâ crucis. Et semel Christus mortuus est in cruce, ibique immolatus est in semetipso; quotidie autem immolatur in sacramento, quia in hoc sacramento recordatio fit illius, quod factum est semel. *Lombard: lib. 4. dist. 12. lit. e. & f.*

Here we plainly see that he determines, that Christ is not properly sacrificed in the Sacrament, but improperly, in that his sacrificing of himselfe upon the crosse is remembered and represented in the Sacrament, which is no more then the Apostle saith, *viz.* that Christs death is shewed forth in the Sacrament, *1 Cor. 11. 26.* And thus *Ambrose* (as *Lombard* doth cite him) *Although we offer daily, it is for the remembrance of his death. — We also offer now, but that which we doe, is a remembrance of the sacrifice which Christ offered.* To this purpose also he cites *Austine*.

Et si quotidie offerimus, ad recordationem mortis ejus fit. — Offerimus & nunc, sed quod nos agimus, recordatio est sacrificii. *Ambrosius: apud Lombard: Ibid.*

Now for the places alledged by the Marquesse, the first, *viz.* *Matt. 11.* doth not particularly concerne the Eucharist, but generally the spirituall worship and service, which the Prophet foresheved should be performed unto God in the time of the New Testament, and which should not be confined and limited

to one certaine place, and as the solemne worship and service of God in the time of the old Testament was, but should be performed in every place, as well in one place as another. This is that which our Saviour said to the Woman of Samaria, *Woman, believe me, the houre commeth, When ye shall neither in this Mountaine, nor yet at Ierusalem worship the Father.*—*The houre commeth, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit, and in truth, &c.* Joh. 4. 21, 23. S. Paul also to the same purpose, *I will therefore that men pray every Where, lifting up holy hands, &c.* 1 Tim. 2. 8. This is that incense and pure offering, which the Prophet *Malachy* said should be offered unto God in every place. This incense and pure Offering are the prayers of the Saints, Revel. 5. 8. And all spirituall sacrifices, which Christians offer acceptable unto God thorough Jesus Christ. 1 Pet. 2. 5. What is this to prove that Christ is truly and properly sacrificed in the Eucharist? It is true, the * Fathers sometimes apply that place of *Malachy* to the Sacrament of the Eucharist; but not as if Christ were there in that Sacrament truly and properly sacrificed, nor as if that place concerned this Sacrament more then any other spirituall worship now to be performed under

* *Iren. lib. 4. cap. 32. Aug. de Civ. Dei lib. 18. c. 35.*

Et in omni loco incensum offertur nomini meo, & sacrificium purum. Incensa autem Joannes in Apocalypsi orationes esse ait sanctorum. *Iren. lib. 4. cap. 33.*

the new Testament. *Irenaeus* in one Chapter applies it to the Sacrament, and in the very next immediately after hee applies it to Prayer. Having cited the words of *Malachy*, *In every place incense is offered to my Name, and a pure offering,* immediately hee adds,

Now John in the Revelation saith that incense are the Prayers of the Saints. So also * *Hierome* in his commentary upon the words of *Malachy*. *Now the Lord directs his speech to the Jewish Priests who offer the Blind, and the Lame, and the sick for sacrifice, that they may know that spirituall sacrifices are to succeed carnall sacrifices. And that not the blood of Bulls, and Goats, but incense, that is, the Prayers of the Saints are to be offered unto the Lord; and*

* Ergo proprie nunc ad sacerdotes Judaeorum sermo fit Domini, qui offerunt caecum & claudum,

& languidum ad immolandum; ut sciant carnalibus victimis spirituales victimas successuras. Et nequaquam raurorum hircorumque sanguinem, sed thymiamam, hoc est, sanctorum orationes Domino offerendas, & non in una orbis provincia, judaea, nec in una Judaeae urbe, Hierusalem, sed in omni loco offerri oblationem nequaquam immundam, ut à populo Israel, sed mundam, ut in ceremoniis Christianorum. *Hieron. ad Mal. 1.*

that

that not in one province of the world, Judea, nor in one City of Judea, Hierusalem, but in every place is offered an offering, not impure, as was offered by the people of Israel, but pure, as is offered in the ceremonies (or services) of Christians. Here it is very observable, that Hierome writing professedly upon the place of the Prophet, to shew the meaning of it, was so far from thinking it to be peculiarly meant of the Eucharist, that hee doth not so much as mention that Sacrament, otherwise then it is comprehended in those spirituall sacrifices, which hee saith are here spoken of: but as hee saith, that spirituall sacrifices in generall are here signified, so particularly hee applieth the words of the Prophet unto prayer, saying that it is the incense which the Prophet speaketh of.

The other place of Scripture, viz. Luke 22.19. is as little to the purpose, though Bellarmine also doth alledge and urge it in the same manner, saying that Christ did not say, *Vobis datur, frangitur, effunditur, sed pro vobis*, is given, broken, shed to you, but for you. But what of this? Wee know and believe that Christs Body was given, and his Blood shed for us on the crosse, in remembrance whereof according to Christs institution wee receive the Sacrament: but doth it therefore follow, that Christ is properly offered and sacrificed in the Sacrament? The ground of this conceit is, that the word is in the present tense, *datur*, is given, not in the future, *dabitur*, shall be given. But this is too weake a foundation to build upon. For

Belarmine cannot deny, but that in the Scripture the present, or the preter tense is often put for the future. And well might it be so here, Christ being now ready to be offered, he instituting the Sacrament the same night that he was betrayed, 1 Cor. 11. 23. the night before hee suffered. And therefore Cardinall

* Cajetan was much more ingenuous then Cardinall Bellarmine. For upon 1 Cor. 11. 23. he notes, that both the Evangelists, and also Paul relating the words of the institution of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, use the present tense *is given*, or *broken*, and *is shed*, because when Christ did institute

Bell. de Miss. l. 1.
1. 2. 1. 2.

Illa verba temporis presentis, &c. Bell. Ibid.

Fateor in Scripturâ sæpè accipi præsens, aut præteritum pro futuro. Bellarm. Ibid.

* At si præsentis temporis verbum, frangitur, in quæstionem quis deducat, animadvertat scripta ab aliis Evangelistis, & cessabit quæstio — Eadem siquidem ratione, quâ illi Evangelistæ futuram in cruce effusionem sanguinis significaverunt in præsentis,

effunditur : eadem ratione Paulus futuram in cruce fractionem carnis Christi significat in presenti, dicendo frangitur. — Communis autem omnium horum ratio (quare scilicet Dominus Jesus in cenâ expressit futuram in cruce sanguinis effusionem, & carnis fractionem verbis presentis temporis) est ut manifestaret discipulis, hujusmodi effusionem, & fractionem non distantem tempore, sed tanquam presentem esse. Et verè loquendo de tempore presenti Grammatico more, tempus effusionis & fractionis erat tunc præsens, quoniam jam inchoatum erat tempus passionis ejus. Ac per hoc sicut inchoate die potest significari verbo presentis temporis quicquid fit, illo die ita inchoato jam die passionis ejus, potuit significari verbo presentis temporis omnis ejus passio. Præsens enim Grammaticè non est instans, sed quoddam confusum præsens. *Cajet. in 1. Cor. 11.*

the Sacrament; though his Body was not yet crucified, nor his Blood shed, yet the crucifying of his Body, and the shedding of his Blood was at hand, and in a manner present. Yea, the time of *Christ's* suffering (hee saith) was then present, as being then begun. And therefore as when the day is begun, wee may signifie in the present tense whatsoever is done that day: so the day of *Christ's* Passion being begun (the Jewes beginning the day at the Evening) all his Passion might be signified by a word of the present tense. The present being taken Grammatically not for an instant, but for a certain time confusedly present. The ancient Writers also have expounded the present tense (used in the words of the institution) by the future:

* Audi ipsum tibi dicentem, quia hic est sanguis meus, qui pro vobis effundetur, &c. *Origen. Hom. 9. in Levit. ab ipso Bellarmino*

*Hear Christ himselfe (saith * Origen) saying unto thee, This is my Blood, which shall be shed, &c. So also † Tertullian rehearseth Christ's words thus, This is my Body, which shall be given for you. And even the vulgar Latine Translation, Mat. 26. 28. & Mar. 14. 24. hath it in the future tense, effundetur, and so Luke 22. 20. fundetur, shall be shed: and 1 Cor. 11. 24. tradetur, shall be given.*

citatus lib. 2. Eucher. cap. 8. † Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur. Tertull. lib. 3. in Marcion. citati à Bellar. de Euchar. lib. 2. cap. 7.

Now for the Fathers, whom the Marquess alledgeth as being of their opinion, I answer, the Fathers indeed doe frequently use the word *sacrifice*, and *offering*, when they speake of the Eucharist; but it doth not therefore follow, that according to their opinion there is a true and proper sacrifice offered in the Eucharist. For it is certaine that they doe also frequently use the same words, when they speake of those things which the Romanists

Romanists themselves acknowledge to be no sacrifices properly so called; even as the Scripture speaketh of the sacrifice of Prayer, *Psal.* 141. 2. of praise, *Heb.* 13. 15. of Almes, *Heb.* 13. 16. of our own selves, *Rom.* 12. 1. And where the Fathers (as the Marquesse observeth) call the Eucharist an *unbloody sacrifice*, they sufficiently shew that properly Christ is not sacrificed in it.

For (as *Bellarmino* himselfe doth tell us)

All sacrifices (properly so called) that the Scriptures speake of, were to be destroyed, and that by staying, if they were things having life; and if they were solid things without life, as fine Flour, Salt, and Frankincense, they were to be destroyed by burning.

Besides Thave shewed before, by the testimony of *Lombard*, that the Fathers sometimes expressly speake of *Christs* being sacrificed in the Eucharist, in that there is a commemoration and remembrance of the sacrifice which *Christ* upon the crosse did offer for us.

* *Bellarmino* objects that Baptisme doth represent the death of *Christ*; and yet none of the ancients doe ever call Baptisme a sacrifice: and therefore the representation of *Christs* death alone could not be the cause why they call the Lords Supper a sacrifice.

* Baptismus est sacramentum representationis mortis Christi: —
Et tamen nulli veterum Bap-

tismum sacrificium Deo oblatum unquam appellaverunt. Non igitur ista sola representatio causa esse potuit cur actio Cœnz Domini sacrificium appellatur. *Bell. de Miss. lib. 1. cap. 2.*

I answer, doubtlesse *Bellarmines* reading was sufficient to informe him that diverse ancient Writers call Baptisme a sacrifice. *Occumenius* upon *Heb.* 10. 26. saith, that the meaning of those words, *there remaineth no more sacrifice for sinnes*, is that there is no second Baptisme to be expected. For by *sacrifice* (hee saith) is there meant the crosse (*Christs* Sacrifice on the crosse) and Baptisme, wherein that sacrifice is represented. After the same manner, and almost the same words writeth *Theophylact* upon that place to the Hebrewes.

ἐν ἀναστάσει τὸ πᾶν ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ νόστον, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶναι δευτέρου βαπτίσματος ἀπαγορεύεται. οὐσίαν γὰρ ἐσταύησαν τὸν ταυτὸν, καὶ τὸ βαπτίσμα καὶ αὐτό. *Occum. in Heb.* 10.

Esime

* Chrysoſt. & ejus ſequaces per hoſtiam intelligunt aut Baptiſmum, aut potiùs mortem Chriſti, quatenus in Baptiſmo operatur. *Eſius in Heb. 10. 26.*

* *Eſius* alſo upon the place ſaith that *Chryſoſtome* and his followers by ſacrifice there underſtand either Baptiſme, or rather the death of Chriſt, as it doth operate in Baptiſme.

† Sed quæriſ quid cauſæ plerique antiquorum fuerit, ut Baptiſmum hoſtiam appellaverint, ideoque dixerint non ſupereſſe hoſtiam pro peccato, quia Baptiſmus re-

† And *Melchior Canus* affirms, that moſt of the ancients did call Baptiſme a ſacrifice, ſaying that there remains no ſacrifice for ſinne, becauſe Baptiſme cannot be repeated. And he gives this reaſon why they ſpake ſo, viz. becauſe in Baptiſme we die together with Chriſt, and the ſacrifice of the croſſe by this Sacrament is applyed unto us for full forgiveneſſe of ſinnes. *Therefore* (ſaith he) *by a metaphore they called Baptiſme a ſacrifice, and ſaid that after Baptiſme there remaineth no ſacrifice, becauſe there is no ſecond Baptiſme.*

peti non poteſt. Sanè quia in Baptiſmo Chriſto commorimur, & per hoc ſacramentum applicatur nobis hoſtia crucis ad plenam peccati remiſſionem; hinc illi Baptiſma tranſlativè hoſtiam nuncuparunt, ac poſt Baptiſma ſemel ſuſceptum nullam hoſtiam eſſe reliquam interpretati ſunt, quia Baptiſma ſecundum non eſt. *Can. Loc. Theolog. lib. 12. cap. 13. pag. 680. Edit. in 8.*

Thus then it may ſufficiently appeare, that there is nothing either in the Scriptures, or in the Fathers, to prove that in the Eucharift Chriſt is offered up unto the Father a ſacrifice properly ſo called, but that both Scriptures and Fathers are againſt it.

Page 71.

In the next place, *VVe ſay* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *that the Sacrament or Orders confers grace upon thoſe, on whom the hands of the Presbytery are impoſed: you both deny it to be a Sacrament, notwithstanding the holy Ghoſt is given unto them thereby; and alſo you deny that it confers any interior grace at all upon them. VVe have Scripture for what we hold, viz. 1 Tim. 4. 14. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, and with laying on the hands of the Presbytery. So 2 Tim. 1. 6. Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands. S. Aug. lib. 4. Quaſt. ſuper Num. S. Cyr. Epist. ad Magnum. Optat. Milevit. the place beginneth, Ne quis miretur. Tertull. in Praſcript. the place beginneth, Edant origines.*

Ans.

Ans. That Orders (or the * Ordination of Ministers) is a Sacrament truly and properly so called, of the same nature with Baptisme and the Lords Supper, they of the Church of Rome do hold, and the Councell of Trent hath denounced *Anathema* against such as deny it. † Protestants on the other side, though they doe not deny but that the name of Sacrament largely taken may be given to Ordination, yet they deny that it is a Sacrament in that sense as Baptisme and the Lords Supper are Sacraments. A Sacrament properly so called (as the name is attributed to Baptisme and the Lords Supper) is a Signe and Seale of the covenant of Grace, confirming unto us that Christ is ours, and we his; that in him we are justified, and through him shall be saved. Thus circumcision was a Sacrament in the time of the old Testament, a token of the Covenant betwixt God and his people, Gen. 17. 11. a Seale of the righteousness of Faith, Rom. 4. 11. So now is Baptisme, Mat. 28. 19. Acts 22. 16. And so the Lords Supper, 1 Cor. 11. 24, 25. But thus Ordination is not a Sacrament, not serving to signifie and seale the covenant of Grace, as Baptisme and the Lords Supper doe. * *Bellarmino* saith, that *Calvin* doth acknowledge Ordination to be a true Sacrament. But *Calvin* so grants it to be a Sacrament, as that he plainly shewes it to be no such Sacrament as Baptisme and the Lords Supper are. As for the true office of a *Presbyter* (or *Elder*, saith hee) which is commended unto us by the mouth of Christ, I willingly account it a Sacrament. For there is a ceremony, first taken from the Scriptures, and then also such as Paul doth testifie not to be empty and superfluous, but a faithfull token and pledge of spirituall grace. But presently after hee addes, Christ hath promised the grace of the holy Ghost, not for the expiating of sins, but for the right governing of the Church.

ter eo loco habeo. Illic enim ceremonia est, primum ex Scripturis sumpta, deinde quam non esse inanem, nec supervacuum, sed fidele Spiritualis gratiae symbolum Paulus testatur. — Spiritus S. gratiam (Christus) promissit, non ad peragendam peccatorum expiationem, sed ad gubernationem Ecclesiae rite obeundam & sustinendam. *Calv. Instit.* lib. 4. cap. 19. Sect. 28.

Thus much also is yeilded by *Chemnitius* (whom yet *Bellarmino* would make to dissent from *Calvin*) There is

* Magis propriè deberet vocari Ordinationio quàm Ordo. *Durand.* l. 4. dist. 24. quest. 1. *Concil. Trid.* Sess. 23. can. 3. † *Chemnit.* in *Ex. Calv. Instit.* l. 4. c. 19. Sect. 28.

* *Calvinus* agnoscit Ordinationem esse verum Sacramentum. *Bellar. de Sacram. Ord.* lib. 1. cap. 1. Quantum ad verum Presbyterii munus, quod ore Christi nobis est commendatum, libenter

Bell. ubi Supra.

Adhuc est promissio, Deum daturam gratiam & dona, quibus ea, quæ ad Ministerium pertinent, rectè, fideliter & utiliter præstare & exequi possint, qui legitime vocati sunt. Joh. 20. Accipite spiritum S. Chemn. in Exon.

Et hæc seria oratio in ordinatione Ministrorum, quia nititur mandato & promissione Divinâ, non est irrita. Hoc vero est, quod Paulus dicit, Donum, quod est in te per impositionem

manuum. Chemn. Ibid. Si hoc modo intelligatur Ordinatio, de Ministerio verbi & Sacramentorum, jamdudum Apologia Augustanæ Confessionis nostrarum Ecclesiarum sententiam declaravit, nos non gravatim Ordinem vocaturos Sacramentum. Et additur ibi, Neque Impositionem manuum vocare Sacramentum gravabimur. Latè enim vocabulum Sacramenti patere supra ostendimus. Ibid.

Bellar. Loc.
suprà. citat.

Thus Chemnitius; whereby it may appeare, that neither doth he dissent (as Bellarmine pretends he doth) from Melancthon, the Author of the Apology of the confession at Auspurg, though I have not now liberty to consult that Author. And thus also it appeares, that though Protestants deny Ordination to be a Sacrament of the same nature with Baptisme, and the Supper of the Lord, and that justifying and saving grace is either conferred, or confirmed by it; yet they doe not deny but that it may be called a Sacrament, and that some interior grace is conferred by it, and that because of those very words of the Apostle, which our Adversaries stand upon, the gifts that is in thee by the laying on of hands.

Racile ostendemus Ordinationem esse verum Sacramentum. Nam gratia, quæ illi promissa est, non est donum

(saith hee) a promise added, that God will give grace, and gifts, whereby they who are lawfully called, may rightly, faithfully, and profitably performe and execute those things, which belong unto the Ministry. Joh. 20. Receive the holy Ghost.

And afterwards againe, This serious prayer (saith hee) used in the Ordination of Ministers, because it builds upon Gods Precept and Promise, is not in vaine. And this is that which Paul saith, The gift, which is in thee by the laying on of hands. Hee addes immediately, If ordination be thus understood, viz. of the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, the Apology of the confession at Auspurg hath long ago declared what our Churches hold, viz. that we are not unwilling to call Order a Sacrament. And there it is added, neither will we stick to call Laying on of hands a Sacrament. For we have shewed before that the word Sacrament is of a large acception.

But Bellarmine will easily prove (he saith) that Ordination is a true Sacrament. For (saith hee) the grace that is promised unto it,

is no common gift, as Prophecy, or the gift of Tongues, but justifying Grace. And this he proves by that 1oh. 20. *Receivete ye the holy Ghost.* For that gift which may be in the ungodly, is never (hee saith) in the Scriptures called absolutely the holy Ghost. He addes also that the gift spoken of 2 Tim. 1. 6. viz. which was given to Timothy in his Ordination, was the Spirit of love, and of power, and of a sound minde, as it followes vers. 7.

ris, sed virtutis, & dilectionis, & sobrietatis. Bell. de Sac. Ord. lib. 1. cap. 2.

I answer, the places alledged doe not prove that justifying grace is promised, or by promise annexed unto Ordination.

For 1. It is not true, that the gift, which may be in the wicked, is never in the Scripture called the holy Ghost. For Acts 19. 6. it is said of some, that when Paul laid his hands upon them, the holy Ghost came on them: yet by the holy Ghost there is meant such a gift of the holy Ghost, as the wicked may receive, viz. the gift of Tongues, and Prophecy: for so immediately it followes, and they spake with Tongues, and Propheesied.

2. Neither doth it appeare, that the Apostle 2 Tim. 1. 7. doth explaine what he meant by the gift mentioned vers. 6. but having exhorted Timothy to stir up the gift that was in him by laying on of hands, hee addes as a motive to inforce the exhortation, For God hath not given unto us the spirit of feare, but &c. As if hee should say, All true Christians have received this Spirit of God, and more especially all faithfull Ministers: therefore stir up the gift that is in thee, &c. But the end of Ordination is not the justification of the person ordained, but the edification of others for whom hee is ordained. Hee gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers. (Why? for what end?) For the perfecting of the Saints, for the worke of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. Ephes. 4. 11, 12.

So * Durandus an acute and learned Schoolemen, saith that the Sacrament of

aliquid gratis datum, ac prophetia, vel donum linguarum, sed gratia justificans. Nam imprimis Joh. 20. cum Dominus tribuit Apostolis potestatem remittendi peccata, quæ est pars quædam sacerdotii, dixit, Accipite Spiritum S. non autem vocatur absolute Spiritus S. in Scripturis donum illud, quod in impiis esse potest. Præterea 2 Tim. 1. ubi dixerat Apostolus gratiam Timotheo per manus impositionem dare, subjungit explicans quæ sit illa gratia, Non enim dedit nobis (id est, nobis Episcopis) Spiritum timo-

Sacramentum Ordinis est spirituale medicamentum, non tamen illius, qui

Ordinem suscipit, qui jam debet esse
sanus, sed communis : quia per
Ordinem efficitur homo dispensator
sacramentorum, *Durand. in Sem. lib. 4.
dist. 24. quest. 1. ad 1^m.*

Si habent (scil. hæretici Spiritum S.)
cur illic Baptizatis, quando ad nos
veniunt, manus imponitur ad acci-
piendum spiritum S. Cum jam utique
illic acceptus sit; ubi si fuit, dari
potuit? *Cyprian. Epist. 77. (Edit.
Pamel.) ad Mag.*

Prior pars Epistolæ ejusdem est argu-
menti cum precedentibus. *Pamel. in
argum. Epist. 77. ad Magnum.*

*Bell. de Sacram.
Ord. lib. 1. c. 3.*

*Order is a spirituall medicine, yet not for him
that is ordained, but for the people; because by
Ordination a man is made a dispenser of the Sa-
craments. &c.*

For the Fathers here objected, there is onely one, viz. *Cyprian*,
that I can punctually answer unto. Hee in the place cited hath
nothing (that I finde) about Ordination.
Hee speakes indeed there of imposition
of hands for the receiving of the holy Ghost;
but the imposition of hands there spoken of
was not by way of Ordination, but by way
of Confirmation, of which I have spoken
before. For *Cyprian* there speakes of laying
hands upon all that had beene baptized by
Heretikes, when they did returne to the Church, and not of
laying hands upon such as did receive Ordination.

The Marquesse himself in the point of Confirmation alledged
Cyprians 71. Epistle, and this which he now alledgeth is in respect
of the former part of it, of the same subject with that, and the rest
that follow, as *Pamelius* noteth in the Ar-
gument of the Epistle. The other Fathers
are so cited, that there is no examining what
they say, without more labour then the thing
is worth, or reason doth require. *Austine* is cited in his questi-
ons upon Numbers, now there are 65 questions upon that booke,
but which of them is meant, is not expressed. In like manner
are *Optatus* and *Tertullian* cited, without any mention made
of the booke, wherein *Optatus* hath any thing to the purpose,
whereas there are seven Bookes, which hee wrote; or of the
Chapter, in which *Tertullian. de Prescript.* speaketh about Or-
dination, whereas that Booke of *Tertullian* hath 53. chapters.
Neither doth *Bellarmin* in this controversie about Ordination
alledge either *Tertullian*, or *Optatus*, at all; nor *Cyprian*, but only
in a worke, which himselfe confesseth to be none of *Cyprians*:
nor yet *Austine* in that place, which the Marquesse citeth. But
how ever, it is granted, that the Fathers sometimes call Ordi-
nation a Sacrament, and so doe Protestants too, as hath beene
shewed; though they deny it to be a Sacrament of the same
nature

nature with Baptisme and the Lords Supper; and so much (as I have shewed) *Durandus* himselfe doth acknowledge, making it to be a remedy provided for the spirituall welfare of others, and not of him that is ordained.

To proceede, *We hold* (saith the Marquesse) that the Priest, Page 71. and other Religious persons, who have vowed chastity to God, may not marry afterwards. You deny first, that it is lawfull to make any such vowes: and secondly; that those who have made any such vows, are not bound to keepe them. We have Scripture for what we hold, Deut. 23. 2. When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it: for the Lord thy God will require it of thee. So 1 Tim. 5. 11, 12. But the younger widowes refuse, for when they have begun to wax wanton against the Lord, they will marry, having damnation, because they have cast off their first Faith. What can be meant hereby but the vow of chastity? or by their first faith, but some promise made to Christ in that behalfe? Otherwise Marriage could not be damnable. So all the ancient Fathers have expounded it. S. Aug. de bono viduit. cap. 9. S. Athanas. de Virginis. S. Epiphani. her. 48. S. Hier. contra Jovin. l. 1. c. 7.

Ans. One thing is here omitted by the Marquesse, which yet we must observe, viz. that they of the Church of Rome hold that Priests and Clergy-men (as they are called) ought not to Marry, and that they restraints them from Marriage, causing them to vow against it. Some of them hold this to be of divine institution; *Bellarmino* though he likes not that, yet makes it to be an Apostolicall decree, which indeed amounts to as much. *Costerus* the Jesuite saith, It is the most holy custome of the Roman Church, agreeable to reason and the Scriptures, and received from our ancestors, not to admit any to holy Orders, but him that is unmarried, or that with the consent of his wife hath consecrated his chastity unto God.

Ego verissimum puto, decretum hoc, quo vovum est annexum Ordinibus, non quidem proprie divinam esse, sed tamen esse Apostolicum,

etc. Bell. de Cler. lib. 1. cap. 18. Sanctissimus mos est Romanæ Ecclesiæ, rationique & Scripturis consentaneus, atque à majoribus acceptus, quo neminem ad sacros ordines admittat nisi celibem, aut qui de uxoris consensu castitatem suam Deo consecravit. *Coster.* Embirid. de Celib. Sacerdot. Quinta propositio.

And the same Author affirms, that although a Priest sinne grievously if hee com-

Sacerdos si fornicetur, aut domi concubinam forcat, tamen gravi facit legio

sefe obstringat,
gravius tamen
peccat, si con-
trahat Mari-
monium. *Ibid.*
Nona propo-
sicio.
Sacerdotibus
nullo modo
permittenda
sunt Matrimo-
nia. *Ibid.* De-
cima propo-
sicio.

Communiter dicitur, quod pro simpliciter fornicatione quis deponi non debet, cum paucissimi sine illo vicio inveniantur. *Gloss. in dist. 81. cap. Maximianus.* Dicunt hodie pro fornicatione neminem deponendum, nisi in ea perdure; & ideo quia hodie fragiliora sunt corpora nostra quam olim erant. *Gloss. in dist. 82. cap. Presbyter.*

mis Fornication, yet much more if hee Marry. And there-
fore hee concludes, that Priests are by no means to be sus-
fered to Marry: Yet they may be suffered to commit fornication;
for so the Glosse upon Gratians Decrees tells us, that
it is commonly held, that one ought not to be deposed for simple fornication.
And marke the reason, because (saith hee) very few are
found without that fault. And so in another p'ce, They say that
now none is to be deposed for fornication, except he continue in it:
and that because our bodies are now more fraile then they were in
times past.

How well doth this agree with the Scripture, which saith that
Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers
and adulterers God will judge? *Heb. 13. 4.* But saith

Si conjugia omnium sunt honorabilia, etiam conjugia consanguineorum in primo & secundo gradu erunt honorabilia; & conjugia adolescentium injussu parentum contracta, erunt honorabilia. *Bell. de Cler. lib. 1. cap. 20.*

In omnibus, i.e. in omnibus legitimè conjunctis, quicumque illi sint, &c. Ita Theophylactus in hunc locum, & videtur magis literalis expositio. *Bellar. Ibid.*

Cam ergo ex sacerdotibus nati in summos Pontifices supra legantur esse promoti, non sunt intelligendi de fornicatione, sed de legitimis conjugii nati: quia sacerdotibus ante prohibitionem ubique licita erant: & in orientali Ecclesia uique hodie licere probantur. *Dist. 56. cap. Canonianensem.*

Bellarmino, if Marriage be honorable in all, then in those that are neare allied, and in those that marry without the consent of their Parents. I answer, Marriage may be, and is honorable in all; and yet not all kind of Marriage. It is lawfull for any to marry, yet not to marry with any; they that marry, must marry in the Lord. *1 Cor. 7. 39.*

Bellarmino himselfe approves of *Theophylact's* Exposition, viz. that Marriage is honourable in all, that is, in all that are lawfully joyned together, whosoever they be: Now such are all they, whom the Scripture doth not exclude, as it doth not the Clergy. *Gratian* himselfe confesseth that it is but an Ecclesiasticall Law, that forbids Priests to marry, and that before this prohibition their Marriage was every where

lawfull, and so in his time was accounted in the Easterne Church. Yea hee saith, that many, whose Fathers were Priests, were promoted to be Popes; and that they were not to be thought borne of fornication, but of lawfull wedlock.

* *Cassander* also acknowledgeth it to have beene but a constitution of the Church, and that though for a while it was expedient, yet afterwards it became a snare to many. He saith, that by the rigid and unseasonable exacting of this constitution, most grievous and abominable scandals are in the church. For that the causes, which moved them in former times to make that constitution, are not onely now ceased, but even turned quite contrary. That by this decree chastity and continency is so far from being confirmed, that thereby a window may seeme to be set open unto all kinde of lust and lewdnesse. And that it fares so now with some Priests, that the society of their godly wives is not onely no hinderance, but it is a helpe and furtherance unto them in respect of their Ecclesiasticall functions and employments, as *Gregory Nazianzen* testifies of his parents.

* Non levibus de causis olim adducti fuerunt proceres Ecclesiæ, &c. —

Contra tamen fatendum est graviter à posterius esse peccatum, qui hanc utilem pro tempore constitutionem multis in laqueum verterunt, &c. *Cassand. Consul. Anti. 23.*

Quare nimis rigida & intempestiva hujus constitutionis exactio, gravissima & abominanda in Ecclesiâ scandala exiisse videmus. Nam causæ illæ, quibus majores ad constitutionem hanc faciendam inductos esse diximus, non solum hodiè cessant, sed in contrarium sunt conversæ. Nam primum videmus hoc decreto usque adeò castitatem & continentiam in Christo non confirmatam, ut per illud ad omne libidinis & flagitii genus fenestra aperta esse videatur. Tuas res in plerisque sacerdotibus ita comparatæ sunt, ut conjugum piarum consortio non modò ad functiones Ecclesiasticas obeundas non impediuntur, sed etiam ad earum procuracionem adjuvantur ab eis: quemadmodum de patre suo Gregorio, & matre Nomia Gregorius Nazianzenus testatur. *Ibid.*

It remaines therefore (he saith) that henceforth this statute be released, and that according to the custome of the ancient Church, and of the Easterne Churches unto this day, honest married men may be admitted to the Ministry of the Church, &c.

Ecclesiæ, & hoc usque Orientalium Ecclesiarum honesti quoque mariti ad Sacerium admittantur, &c.

Restat primum ut in posterum ordinandis hoc statutum relaxetur, & more veteris Ecclesiæ Mini-

There are weighty causes (hee saith) why this constitution should be released. And he cites *Panormitan* (a Cardinall, and great

Sunt igitur hujus constitutionis relaxandæ graves causæ, &c. Prudenter itaq; observavit & monuit Panormitanus,

Canonist)

Experientiâ docente contrariû prorsus effectû securû ex lege illâ continentiz, cum hodiè non vivant spiritualiter, nec sint mundi, sed maculentur illicito coitu cum illorum gravissimo peccato, ubi cum propriâ uxore esset castitas. Unde debere Ecclesiam facere sicut bonus medicus, ut si medicina experientiâ docente magis oblit quam profit, eam tollat. *Ibid.*

Sunt autem causæ non leves, cur hodiè iis quoque, qui jam ordinati, non libidine, sed conscientia ducti, uxores duxerunt, & Ecclesiis utiles esse possunt, gratia hujus legis fieri debeat, &c. *Ibid.* Posterior error longè gravior est, non solum licere ante Ordinationem, sed etiam post Ordinationem, uxorem ducere. *Bell. de Cler. l. 1. cap. 19.*

Cum igitur hæc Matrimonii contractio post Ordinationem solo statuto prohibeatur, & exempla prisca extant, quæ testentur, hujusmodi statuta non tam anxie observata fuisse, quin ob Ecclesiæ necessitatem aliquando relaxata fuerint, quis non concedat in extremâ hæc Ecclesiæ necessitate hoc idem hodiè fieri posse? — Cur autem etiam in Ordinatis conjugium hodiè admitti possit, hæc ratio est, quod ex hujusmodi conjugio non modò nulla offensio populi, sed magna etiam utilitas sit expectanda. Nam eò res jam rediit, ut vix centesimum invenias, qui ab omni commercio fæminarum absteineat, populus verò ita affectus est, ut sacerdotis fornicatoris vel concubinarij Ministerium vel prorsus condemnet, vel levius æstimet: maritum verò sacerdotem æquius ferat, ut cum populo quoque jam notum sit, honorabile esse in omnibus conjugium, adulteros autem, & fornicatores à Deo judicandos. *Ibid.*

Canonist) observing and admonishing, that experience shewes, that a quite contrary effect hath followed by that Law of continency, when as now they doe not live spiritually, nor are pure, but defiled with unlawfull copulation, to their most great sinne, whereas with their own wives they might live chastly. That the church there-

fore ought to doe, as a good Physician doth, who if he finde by experience, that the medicine doth more hurt then good, hee will prescribe it no longer.

He goes further yet, and holds that not onely they, who were married before, may be ordained, and yet still keepe their conjugall society, but also that such as are already ordained, may afterwards marry, and yet still continue their Ministry; though *Bellarmino* doth call this an error much more grievous then the other, that not onely before Ordination, but even after Ordination it is lawfull to marry. But surely both Scripture and reason shewes this as lawfull as the other. And to returne to *Cassander*, hee testifies that marrying after Ordination is onely forbidden by humane statute; and that ancient examples doe shew that such Statutes are not precisely observed, but that when the necessity of the Church doth require it, they are dispensed with; and therefore so it ought to be now (hee saith) in this case, there being so great neede of it. And hee gives this reason why they that are ordained should be permitted to marry, because not onely no offence, but much benefit is to be expected by it. For that scarce one of a hundred is to be found, who doth wholly abstaine from women, and the people are so affected, that if a Priest be a fornicatour, or keepe a concubine,

they

they will either altogether condemne his Ministry, or make lesse account of it, and will rather suffer a Priest that is married, it being now known even to the people, that *Marriage is honorable in all, and that Whore-mongers and Adulterers God will judge.* Wherefore (he saith) if ever it were time to change an ancient custome, then certainly these times call for a change of this custome, though it be ancient, when as all most good and religious Priests, acknowledging their weakenesse, and abhorring the filthinesse of continuall Fornication, if they dare not doe it publickly, yet privately doe marry. Hee concludes, that the matter being brought almost to this, that a Priest must either be married, or have a concubine, every one must needs see, that though there be some inconvenience in this Marriage, yet it is to be chosen as a lesse evill then the other.

Quare si unquam tempus fuit antiquæ alicujus consuetudinis immutandæ, certè hæc tempora hujus quamvis præci moris immutationem aliquam efflagitare videntur, cum optimi

quique, & religiosissimi sacerdotes, infirmitatem suam agnoscetes, & perpetuæ fornicationis fœditatem exhorrescentes, si publicè non audent, certè privati in conjugium ineunt, &c. Cum igitur hoc tempore, eò necessitatis res propemodum redacta sit, ut aut conjugatus, aut concubinaris sacerdos sit admittendus, quis non videt, etiam si quid in hoc conjugio sit incommodi, minoris mali ratione potius esse eligendum? *Ibid.*

This was the judgement of *Cassander*, a man of such note and eminency in his time, that two Emperours, viz. *Ferdinand* the first, and *Maximilian* the second, made choyce of him above all, as a man most meete to compose (if it might be) the differences betwixt Protestants and them of the Church of *Rome*.

Now whereas the Marquesse saith, that Protestants hold it unlawfull to make vowes of chastity; it is true, such vowes of chastity as are made & maintained in the Church of *Rome*, which (as hath beene shewed by the testimony of *Cassander*) prove snares, and occasions of much unchastity, such vowes (I say) Protestants doe indeed, and that most justly, hold unlawfull. None ought to vow that which is not in his power to performe; this is granted by all. Now it is not in every ones power to live unmarried, nor in the power of any, but to whom God is pleased to give it. *I would that all men were even as I my selfe,* (saith *S. Paul*) *but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that.* 1 Cor. 7. 7. And when the

Disciples said, *If the cause of the man be so with his wife, it is good not to marry*: our Saviour answered, *All men cannot receive this saying, but they to whom it is given. Mat. 19, 10, 11.* And againe v. 12. having said, *There be Eunuches, which have made themselves Eunuches for the Kingdoms of Heavens sake*, hee addes immediately, *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.*

Ita fere omnes exponunt, ac si sensus esset, Non omnes, quod dicitis, præstare possunt, i.e. uxore carere; quia non omnes castitatis donum habent, sed quibus datum est. Quam interpretationem adduci non possum ut loquar, &c. Maldou. ad loc.

Maldonate though hee would wrest the words another way, yet hee is forced to confesse that generally all do expound them thus, *All are not able to performe that which you speake of, viz. to be without a wife: because all have not the gift of continence, but onely they to whom it is given.* And though any see no necessity of marrying for the

present, yet they know not what necessity there may be of it afterwards; and therefore to vow against it must needs be rash and dangerous. The Apostle bids, *to avoide Fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband, 1 Cor. 7. 2.* And is it lawfull then for any to vow never to marry, when as they know not but that thereby they shall expose themselves to the danger of Fornication? Even as they of the Church of Rome by their vowes doe, very few being free from Fornication, as I have shewed before by the confession of Cassander, and so of the Glosse upon Gratian. So also againe the Apostle speaking to the unmarried, saith, *If they cannot containe, let them marry; for it is better to marry then to burne. 1 Cor. 7. 9.* But the vowes of chastity which the Romanists speake of, and contend for, presuppose that it is in any ones power to containe, and that there is no feare of such burning, as the Apostle speaks of. And whereas the Apostle would not have any under 60. years old to be chosen into the number of widdowes, though without any vow that wee reade of, 1 Tim. 5. 9. they of the Church of Rome allow as well young as old, of both Sexes, to vow to live unmarried.

Exigit hanc ætatem, quia in hac ætate non solet esse periculum incontinentiæ. Est. in 1 Tim. 5. 9.

Elstius himselfe upon the place saith, *that the Apostle requires that age; because in that there is not to be no danger of incontineney.*

But

But hee addes presently after, that in the Apostles times they had no Monasteries, or close places, to keepe Women in, professing continency, that so they might not freely wander abroad unto men. I doe easily believe that there were indeed as then no such places, nor yet any such profession neither, excepting such Widdowes as the Apostle speakes of, of whom more anon. But withall I suppose, that although wandering abroad may be an occasion of defilement, as the example of *Dinah* sheweth, yet walles and barres are not enough to preserve chastity. And howsoever this is nothing to those young Priests, that vow chastity, and yet are not shut up in that manner as their Nunner are. That to be able to live a single life, is no common gift, and consequently that such a life is not to be so commonly vowed, as now it is in the Church of *Rome*, diverse of the Fathers doe informe us, though some of them went too faure in this kinde. *Hilary* speaking of those severall kindes of Eunuchs mentioned by our Saviour, *Mat. 19.* saith, that one is so by nature, viz. he that is borne so; another so by necessity, viz. hee that is made so; and the third so by will, viz. he that in hope of the Heavenly Kingdom hath determined to be so. And such (hee saith) Christ would have us to be, if (marke that) yet wee be able. *Hierome*, a man of excellent learning, and of great piety, of all the ancient Fathers seemes most exorbitant, as concerning Virginity; surely in his writings against *Jovinian* hee expelleth him selfe many times very harshly; as thus, *If it be good not to touch a Woman; then it is evil to touch a Woman.* And againe, *What kinde of good, I pray you, is that, which hinders from praying?* So hee wreits the words of the Apostle, as if he spake of ordinary Prayer, taking no notice of fasting, which the Apostle joynes with Prayer, *1 Cor. 7. 5.* The Apostle (hee saith)

Tunc nondum structa erant monasteria, seu claustra, quibus coerceretur feminae continentiam professae, ne ad viros evagandi liberam potestatem haberent. *Es. Ibid.*

In uno posuit naturam, in altero necessitatem, in tertio voluntatem. Naturam in eo, qui nascitur; necessitatem in eo, qui ira factus est; voluntatem in illo, qui spe regni caelestis talis esse decreverit: cui nos similes esse, si tamen possimus [NB.] admonuit, *Hilary. can. 19. in. Mat.*

* Si bonum est mulierem non tangere, malum est ergo tangere. *Hieron. contra Jovinian. lib. 1.*

Oro te, quale istud bonum est, quod orare prohibet? — Jubet idem Apost. in alio loco, ut semper oremus. Si semper orandum est, nunquam ergo conjugio servendum: quoniam quotiescunque uxori debitum reddo, orare non possum. *Hieron. Ibid.*

Si semper orandum est, ergo semper carendum Matrimonio. Hier. Ibid.

Vz pregnantibus, &c. Non hic scorta, non lupanaria condemnantur, de quorum damnatione nulla dubitatio est: sed utri

tumefcentes, & infantum vagitus, & fructus atque opera nuptiarum. Hier. ibid. Consideranda vis verbi, Replete terram: Nuptiæ terram replent, virginitas paradysum. Hieron. ibid.

De Adam & Evâ illud dicendum, quod ante offensam in paradiso virgines fuerint: post peccatum autem, & extra Paradysum protinus nuptiæ. Hieron. ibid.

elsewhere bids pray alwayes. If wee must pray alwayes, then wee must never doe the office of married persons. For whensoever I render due benevolence to my wife, I cannot pray. And in the same manner againe, If wee must pray alwayes, then wee must alwayes be free from Marriage. And citing those words, *Wee to them that are with child.* &c. Mat. 24. 19. hee saith, *Not harlots and brothelhouses are here condemned, of whose condemnation there is no doubt; but great bellies, and the crying of infants, and the fruits and effects of Marriages.* Thus also doth hee wrest that spoken to our first Parents, *Bee fruitfull and multiply, and replenish the Earth.* Gen. 1. 28. *Marriage* (saith he) *doth replenish the Earth; but virginity doth replenish Paradise.* And he saith, that *Adam and Eve before they had sinned, were virgins; but after the fall, and out of Paradise, they were Married.*

Whereas nothing is more cleare in the Scripture then this, that God did joyne Adam and Eve together in Marriage before the fall, when they were in Paradise. Diverse other such like inconvenient passages hee hath, being carried away with

the heate of contention. Yet even Hierome himselfe in that very booke doth shew, that to live unmarried, is no ordinary matter, nor for every one to undertake. This (saith hee) is a hard matter, and all doe not receive it, but they to whom it is given. And againe, Doe not feare lest all become Virgins. Virginity is a hard thing; and therefore rare, because hard.—If all could be virgins, the Lord would never say, Let him that is able to receive it, receive it. Neither would the Apostle be so fearfull in perswading to virginity, saying, Now concerning virgins I have no Commandement of the Lord. 1 Corinthians

Rectè quidem sentitis, ait, quod non expedit homini ad cælorum regna tendenti, accipere uxorem: sed difficilis res est, & non omnes capiunt verbum istud, verum quibus datum est. Hieron. ibid.

Noli metuere, ne omnes virgines fiant, difficilis res est virginitas, & ideo rara, quia difficilis.—Si omnes virgines esse possent, nunquam & Dominus diceret, Qui potest capere, capiat: & Apostolus in suadendo non trepidaret, De virginibus autem præceptum Domini non habeo. Hieron. Ibid.

virgins I have no Commandement of the Lord. 1 Corinthians 7. 25.

And

And in his commentary upon *Mat. 19.* *Christ* (saith hee) *inferres, Hee that is able to receive it, let him receive it; that every one may consider his strength. Whether he be able to performe those things that are required of unmarried persons. For virginity of it self is pleasing, and alluring any one unto it; but mens strength is to be considered, that he that is able to receive it, may receive it.* It's true, *Hierome* saith there a little before, that hee that askes it, and labours for it, may receive it: but that must be understood, if God see it to be for his glory, and our good. So is that to be interpreted, *Aske, and it shall be given unto you. Mat. 7. 7.* And so also that, *What things soever yee desire, when yee pray, believe that yee receive them, and yee shall have them. Mar. 11. 24.* The Lord will give grace, and glory; as the Psalmist saith, *Psal. 84. 11.* And so consequently he will give all things that have a necessary connexion with grace and glory; such things may simply and absolutely be prayed for. But virginity is not of that nature, and therefore there can be no such assurance of obtaining it, although we pray for it.

* *Gregory* also saith, that those words of our Saviour, *All doe not receive this saying*, shew that all are not capable of it; and that it is a thing hard to be obtained. And hee saith, that they that are unmarried, are to be admonished to get into the haven of Wedlock, if they endure the stormes of temptation so as to endanger their salvation. And that because it is written, *It is better to marry, then to burne.* Indeed hee addes immediately, that it is no sinne for them to marry, if yet they have not vowed that which is better, hee meanes, to live unmarried. But the question is how such could lawfully vow a single life, not knowing how unmeet they should be for it. And how obligatory such a vow is, wee shall consider anon.

tela teneatur. Greg. Pass. par. 3. admon. 29. Admonendi sunt itaque, ut si tentationum procillas cum difficultate salutis tolerant, conjugii portum petant. Scriptum namque est, Melius est nubere, quam uri. *Greg. Ibid. admonit. 28.* Sine culpa quippe ad conjugium veniunt, si tamen necdum meliora voverunt. *Gregor. ibid.*

Unde & insert, Qui potest capere, capiat: ut unusquisque consideret vires suas, utrum possit virginalia & pudicitiae implere praecepta. Per se enim castitas blanda est, & quemlibet ad se alliciens: sed considerandae sunt vires, ut qui potest capere, capiat. *Hieron. in Mat. 19.*

* Veritas dicit, Non omnes capiunt verbum hoc. Quod eo innuit summum esse, quo denegavit omnium: & dum praedicit quia difficile capitur, audientibus inquit, caprum cum qua cautela

* Utinam
magis turgim
inchoantur,
sedentes com-
putarent ne
forte sumptus
non habeant
ad perficien-
dum. Utinam

qui continere non valent, perfectionem temerarie profiteri, aut celibatui dare nomina vererentur. Sumptuosa siquidem turris est, & verbum grande, quod non omnes capere possunt. Bern. de Convers. ad Cler. cap. 29.

But thus also * Bernard complaining of the incontinency of the Clergy in his time, I wish (saith hee) that they who are about to build a Tower, would sit down, and count the cost, lest they prove unable to finish what they take in hand. I would that they who cannot containe, would be afraid rashly to profess perfection, and to give up their names to a single life. For it is a costly Tower, and a great Word, which all are not able to receive.

Quanto tolera-
bilis tali fuisse
perjurium
Sacramento?
Amb. Offic. lib. 3.
cap. 12.

In omni voto
vel Sacra-
mento intelli-
guntur huius-
modi gene-
rales condicio-
nes; Si Deus

voluerit, si vixero, si potero. Gloss. in Claus. 22. Quest. 2. cap. Beatus. In malis promissis rescinde fidem: in iurpi voto muta decretum: quod incaute vovisti, ne facias: impia est promissio, quæ scelere adimpletur. Claus. 22. Quest. 4. cap. In malis.

Now for the other charge against Protestants, viz. that they hold, that such as have made vowes to live unmarried, are not bound to keepe them; I answer, they hold indeed, that such vowes being made, and tending to the prejudice of a mans soule by exposing him to unavoidable danger of Fornication without using the remedy of Marriage, doe not binde, but are better broken then kept; even as it had beene better that Herod had broken his Oath then that he should keepe it so as for his Oathes sake to cause John Baptist to be beheaded. That of the Apostle holds good in respect of all, To avoide Fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her owne husband. 1 Cor. 7. 2. And that v. 9. If they cannot containe let them marry: for it is better so marry then to burne. As therefore none ought simply and absolutely to vow a single life, so if they have vowed, they ought to repent of their rashnesse, and not to adde sin to sin by keeping their vow whatsoever follow upon it, but rather to marry then to burne with lust, or to commit Fornication. The Gloss upon Gratian tells us, that in every Vow, or Oath, such generall conditions as these are understood, If God will, If I live, If I be able. And Gratian himselfe cites that of Isidore, In evill promises breake thy word; in a dishonest vow change thy purpose; that which thou hast unadvisedly vowed, doe not performe: it is a wicked promise, which is performed by wickednesse.

The same words are also cited by Lombard in his Sentences. To this purpose also Aquinas. He that voweth. (saith hee) doth after a sort appoint a Law unto himselfe, binding himselfe unto something, which in it selfe, and for most part is good. For it may happen that in some case it is either simply evill, or unprofitable, or hinders a greater good, which is against the nature of that which fallt under a vow, as appears by what hath bene said before. And therefore it is necessary, that it be determined, that in such a case a vow is not to be kept. And so againe that Angelicall Doctour, as they stile him, If by observing a vow great and manifest grievance ensue, a man ought not to keepe such a vow.

vel simpliciter malum, vel inutile, vel majoris boni impeditivum, quod est contra rationem ejus quod cadit sub voto, ut ex prædictis patet. Et ideo necesse est, quod determinetur in tali casu votum non esse servandum. Aquin. 2.2. qu. 88. art. 10. Si ex observatione talis voti magnum & manifestum gravamen sentiet, & non esset facultas ad superiorem recurrendi, non deberet homo tale votum servare. Aquin. Ibid. art. 2. ad 3^m.

And * Cyprian writing of some that had professed virginity, but were found to act contrary to their profession, upon that occasion gives this advice; If they faithfully dedicate themselves to Christ, let them continue honest and chaste without any simulation; and so being strong and stable, let them expect the reward of virginity. But if they will not, or cannot persevere, it is better that they marry, then that they fall into the fire by their offences.

mium virginitalis expectent. Si autem perseverare solent: vel non possunt, melius est nubant; quam in ignem delictis suis cadant. Cyprian lib. 1. Epist. 21. vel Epist. 62. Edit. Pamel.

† Bellarmine would have Cyprian here onely to admonish such as have not vowed continency, rather to marry then to vow, if they have not a firme purpose to persevere. But the words of Cyprian cannot without violence done unto them be otherwise understood then of those Virgines, who did dedicate themselves to Christ (as hee speaks) by professing continency.

monet alias, ut si non habent firmum propositum perseverandi, non voveant, sed nubant. Bell. de Monach. lib. 3. cap. 34. Loqui Cyprianum de ijs Virgineibus, quæ simplex (ut loquuntur) votum castitatis emisserunt, non de volatis, quarum votum erat solenne, multa sunt, &c. quæ convincere videantur. Pamel. in Cyp.

Lomb. lib. 3. dist. 39. lit. 1.

Ille, qui vover, quodammodo sibi statuit legem, obligans se ad aliquid, quod est secundum se, & in pluribus, bonum. Potest tamen contingere quod in aliquo casu sit

* Quod si ex fide se Christo dicaverunt, pudice & caste sine ulla fabula perseverent; ita fortes & stabiles præ-

† S. Cyprianus occasione quarundam Virginum, quæ parum honestè se gerbant post votum continentie,

And

And so *Pamelius*, though hee make some use of that other Exposition of *Cyprians* words, yet hee cannot but confesse that *Cyprian* spake of those Virgins that vowed chastity; onely to mitigate the matter, he will have *Cyprian* to speake of such as onely made a simple vow, and not a solemne vow, as they distinguish it. But this is nothing; for the Scripture speaking of the force of vowes, and requiring the performance of them, doth not use any such distinction, nor give any intimation, that a simple vow more then that which is solemne may be broken, if it be just and lawfull. A vow hath its power of binding, not from the solemnity of it, but from its nature, viz. that it is a promise made to God; whether it be made solemnely or no, is not materiall; though its true, the more solemne that it is, the greater is the scandall in the breaking of it, but the sin otherwise is the same, whether the vow be simple or solemne.

* Hoc votum
(nempe simplex) habet
efficaciam ex
jure divino.
Aquin. 2.2. a.

quest. 189. art. 5. Clemens dicit, quod apud Deum non minus obligat votum simplex, quam votum solemne. *Bonav. in Sen. l. 4. dist. 38. art. 2. qu. 1.*

* *Aquinas* speaking of a simple vow, wherein no solemnity is used, saith, *This vow is efficacious by divine right.* And *Bonaventure* cites this saying of *Clemens*, *A simple vow doth binde in respect of God, no lesse then a solemne vow.*

For the Scriptures alledged against us, that *Deut. 23.2.* and so diverse other places doe indeed require those that make a vow, to performe it: but this cannot be understood of all vows whatsoever, but onely of lawfull vowes. For (as I have shewed) unlawfull vowes are not to be kept, but to be broken; and I have also shewed, that vowes of chastity, when they prove snares, and hinderances of chastity, are unlawfull, and so consequently to be broken. There is more difficulty in the other place,

Quo loco per primam fidem nihil aliud intelligi potest, nisi continentiae voru, ut omnes omnino veteres intellexerunt. *Bell. de Monach. lib. 2. cap. 24.*

viz. *1 Tim. 5. 11, 12.* concerning which place also *Bellarmino* saith that nothing can there be meant by *first saith*, but the vow of continency; and that generally all ancient Writers did so understand it.

But it doth not appeare by any thing in the words of the Apostle, that the widdowes, which hee speaketh of, did make any such vow; although by entring into the number of Widdowes, that were main-

maintained by the publike charge of the Church, and withall did service to the Church, in attending the sick, and the like, they did in a fort professe that they intended to live unmarried. What neede was there for such Widdowes to vow continency, when as none of them were to be under 60. years old? *1 Tim. 5.9.*

Bellarmino tells us, that the Apostle, saying, *Let not a Widow be chosen under threescore years old; and, The younger Widdowes refuse,* that is, doe not chuse them, doth not speak of admission unto the vow of continency, as if the younger Widdowes might not be allowed to vow it; but hee speakes either of election unto a certaine Office and Order of Deaconesse; or (which he thinkes more probable) of admission into the number of these Widdowes, which were maintained

by the Church. But there is scarce any thing found in all this, save that it is true indeed, the Apostle doth not speake of admission to the vow of continency, there being no such vowing in those times: but it is evident, that the Apostle speakes of admission to a kinde of profession of continency. For therefore he bids refuse the younger Widdowes, because of their incontinency; *But the younger Widdowes (saith he) refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry. 1 Tim. 5.11. And vers. 14. I will therefore that the younger Women marry, &c.* As if hee should say, let not such as are not likely to containe, be admitted among those who are to live unmarried. Now these, it seemes, were such as both had a kinde of Office in the Church, were Deaconesses, as *Phoebe* is stilled *Rom. 16. 1.* according to the Originall; and also had maintenance from the Church. The former appears by *1 Tim. 5.9, 10.* The latter by *1 Tim. 5.3, 4, 16.* So that whereas *Bellarmino* would make severall Expositions of these, they are to be joyned together to make one intire Exposition. And in both these respects, viz. both in respect of the Office, and in respect of the maintenance, though more especially (it seemes) in respect of the Office, these Widdowes were to remaine Widdowes, and not to marry againe; and that there might be little feare of their marrying the

Dico Apostolum, cum ait, Vidua eligatur non minus sexaginta annorum: &, Adolescentiores viduas devota, i.e. non eas eligas, non loqui de admissione ad votum continentiae, sed vel de electione ad quandam praefecturam, & ordinem Diaconissae. — vel, quod probabilius est, de admissione ad numerum earum viduarum, quae ab Ecclesia alebantur. *Bellar. de Monach. l. 2. c. 24.*

the Apostle would have the younger Widdowes refused, and none admitted but such as were threescore years old, or more. But the greatest difficulty is, what is meant by the *first faith*, which the Apostle saith the younger Widdowes did cast off, and therefore had damnation, 1 Tim. 5. 12. It is true, the ancient Writers for most part expound it of a promise, or covenant of a single life; but all that goe this way, doe not speake of any

vow that was made: neither *Chrysostome*, nor *Theophylact* doth upon the place. Yea, some of the antients shew that they understood the Apostle as speaking of the Christian faith, or the common faith, as it is called Tit. 1. 4. sure I am, some of them make use of the Apostles words, and apply them that way. *Hierome* speaking of Heretikes saith that they have cast off (or made void) their

Fidem pactum dicit. Chrysost.

Fidem conventa dicit, & pactiones. Theophyl.

Licet non sint digni fide, qui fidem primam irritam fecerunt; Marcionem loquor, & Basilidem, & omnes hereticos, &c. Hieron. prefat. in Epist. ad Tit.

* Scitum etenim cunctis est, quam graviter, &c. invehatur in quosdam B. Apost. Paulus, qui mirâ levitate nimium citò translati fuerant ab eo,

qui eos vocaverat in gratiam Christi, in aliud Evangelium, quod non est aliud: qui coarctarunt sibi Magistros ad sua desideria, à veritate quidem auditum averterentes, conversi verò ad fabulis; habentes damnationem, quod primam fidem irritam fecissent. *Vincent. Lirin. advers. Hares.*

Quòd debeat fides hoc loco pro pacto ac voto accipi, non pro fide Christianâ, quâ Deo credimus, colligitur ex illo verbo adjuncto (irritam fecerunt.) Nam fides, quâ Deo credimus, non rectè dicitur irritari, sed amitti, vel corrumpi: pacta autem & vota propriissime irritari dicuntur. *Bell. ubi supra.*

*first faith. So * Vincentius Lirinensis in his Booke against Heresies, saith, It is well knowne, how grievously the blessed Apostle Paul doth inveigh against those, who with wonderfull lightnesse are quickly removed from him: that called them to the grace of Christ, unto another Gospell, which is not another: who heape up so themselves teachers, after their own lusts, turning away their Eares from the truth, being turned unto fables; having damnation because they have made void their first faith.*

Bellarmino therefore was more curious and criticall, if not rather more captious and contentious, then tender and respective of the credit of these antient Doctours, when he said, that *faith* here must be taken for covenant and vow (yet there may be a covenant where there is no vow) and cannot be

taken for Christian faith, because Christian faith is not rightly said to be made void, but to be lost, or corrupted: but covenants and

VOWES

vowes are most properly said to be made voide, *Hierom* and *Vincimus* understood the propriety of words as well as *Bellarmino*, who shewes himselfe * barbarous in these very words, wherein he so playes the critick ; yet they (wee see) thought it not improper to say, that Heretikes make voide the faith, which is necessarily meant of the Christian faith, and not of any vow or covenant. Nether doe I see but that wee may as properly say, that faith, being meant of the Christian faith, is made voide, as that the Law is made voide, *Heb.* 10. 18. or that the grace of God is made voide, *Gal.* 2. 21. wee read it in the former place *despised*, in the other place *frustrate*, but the Greeke word in both places is the same with that in the Epistle to *Timothy*. And as the words will well beare this sense, viz. that it is the Christian faith, which the Apostle faith, some did cast off, or make void, so this sense is agreeable to the Apostles expressions in other places of this Epistle. *Holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwrack.* 1 Tim. 1. 19. *If they continue in faith.* 1 Tim. 2. 15. *Some shall depart from the faith,* 1 Tim. 4. 1. And in the very same Chapter, in which are the words controverted, *If any provide not for his own, &c. he hath denied the faith, &c.* * 1 Tim. 5. 8. So also in the other Epistle to *Timothy* ; *who concerning the truth have erred, &c. and overthrow the faith of some.* 2 Tim. 2. 18. *Men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.* 2 Tim. 3. 8. *I have kept the faith.* 2 Tim. 4. 7. In all these places faith is understood of Christian faith : and therefore probably so is it in that other place, about which wee dispute. So that this may well be the meaning of the place, that they, of whom the Apostle speakes, being censured of the Church for their lightnesse and lasciviousnesse, and not able to beare the disgrace, did quite cast off the Christian faith, which before they professed, and so exposed themselves unto damnation. I see nothing uncouth, nor incongruous in this Exposition ; and it doth well agree with that which the Apostle faith a little after, *For some are already turned after Satan.* 1 Tim. 5. 15. which words seeme to import a plaine and open renouncing of Christ, as on the other side to come after CHRIST, is as much as to professe his Name. *Mat.* 16. 24. *Luke* 9. 23.

* *Irritari* twice put for *irrita fieri.*

1 Tim. 5. 12.
ἠδὲ τινος αἰ.
Heb. 10. 18.
ἀθετήσας.
Gal. 2. 21.
ἀθετῶ.

* See also
1 Tim. 6. 10.
& 21.

Object. But may some say, the Apostle reproves these of whom hee speaks; for that they begin to wax wanton against Christ, and will marry, which argues, that they had vowed, or professed continency; for else why might they not marry? *The wife is bound by the Law so long as her husband liveth: but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will, only in the Lord.* 1 Cor. 7. 39.

Ans. I grant, that those Widdowes, though they did not vow, yet by the very course of life which they entred upon, did professe continency, marriage and that course being inconsistent. And justly might they be reproved both for their rashnesse in taking upon them that profession, and for their lightnesse in falling off from it when there was no just cause for it. The Apostle doth not simply condemne them for having a minde to marry, but because out of wantonnesse they would needs marry. And it might be called wantonnesse against Christ, because they had addicted themselves to the service of Christ in his Church and Members, which service they did desert by their wantonnesse. And in this sense, by *their first faith* may be meant the promise, either formall, or virtuall, which those Widdowes did make unto the church, that they would remaine Widdowes, and not marry; which promise they breaking meerely out of wantonnesse, well might the Apostle say that they had damnation for it. But all this proves not that it is sinfull and damnable for any that have vowed continency, afterwards to marry. Though *Bellarmino* will by no means endure that those words of the Apostle, *I will therefore that the younger Widdowes marry,* &c. 1 Tim. 5. 14. be understood of such as had professed continency, as if the Apostle would have such to marry, if they could

not containe. So also *Estius* upon the place, who saith, that otherwise the Apostle should cast them headlong into damnation. *For if they have damnation, who have a will to marry; how much more they that doe marry?* But though I thinke, that the Apostles direct meaning was, that the younger Widdowes

should not be admitted into the number of those who were by their place and calling to professe continency, into which number

Bell. de Mon. lib.
2. cap. 30.

Non hoc dicit Apost. de junioribus illis viduis, quæ jam voverant se non amplius nupturas. Neque n. eas vult præcipitare in damnationem. Nam si damnationem habebant nubere volentes, quanto magis nubentes?
Est. ad 1. Tim. 5. 14.

ber hee would have none admitted under 60. years old; yet *Estiu* his reason is not valid. For the Apostle doth not say, that the younger Widdowes being admitted into that number, and afterwards willing to marry, or actually marrying, therefore had damnation; but because they would marry out of wantonnesse, and so out of wantonnesse make voide their first faith, viz. their promise of continency made to the Church, if not their Christian Faith, which before they professed. Notwithstanding which sentence, it followes not, but that if, not through wantonnesse, but through weaknesse, they were forced to marry, the Apostle would have them to doe it rather then to doe worse, viz. burne with lust, and commit Fornication.

For whereas the same authour saith, *It is not better for such as have vowed continency, so marry, then to burne*, this is nothing else but a flat contradicting of the Apostle; or at least a contradicting of that Rule, *We must not distinguish, where the Law doth not distinguish*. And we finde in their own Canons, that if Widdows did professe continency, yet a snare was not to be cast upon them, to wit, as the Glosse doth expound it, *by separating them from their Husbands, if they did marry, or by forbidding them precisely to marry*. Another Canon also, which they have, injoynes no more but this, that *if such as professe Virginity, did afterwards marry, they should be ranked amongst those that did marry the second time, viz. after the death of the first yoke fellow*: which marriage the Scripture doth clearly allow, *Rom. 7. 39.* neither did any Orthodox Writer Their Canon-Law indeed debarres those that are twice married, from being Priests, (grounding upon the Apostle, *1 Tim. 3. 2.* and *Titus 1. 6.* which places their owne Cardinall Cajetan doth yet interpret otherwise) but yet grant that such doe not sinne.

Qui continentiz voto sunt alligari, iis non est melius nubere, quam uri. *Est. ad 1. Cor. 7. 9.*

Non est distinguendum, ubi lex non distinguit.

Nos autem nullum talibus laqueum debemus injicere. *Pellag. apud Grat. Caus. 27. quest. 1. cap. De viduis.*

Laqueum: eos separando; vel eos precise prohibendo ne contrahant. *Gloss. ibid.*

Quotquot Virginitatem pollicitam pravaricarunt sunt, professione contempti, inter bigamos, i. e. qui ad secundas nuptias transferunt, haberi debent. *Caus. 27. quest. 1. cap. Quotquot.*

7. 2, 3. and 1 Cor. ever condemne it.

Qui iteraverit conjugium, culpam quidem non habet coinquinati, sed prae-rogativa exiit sacerdotis. *Dist. 26. cap. Qui sine.*

Cajet. in 1 Tim. 3.

They grant also that

Quidam nubentes post votum afferunt adulteros esse: ego autem dico vobis, quod graviter peccant, qui tales dividentur.

Dist. 27. cap. Quidam. Si vir simplex Virginitatis votum habens, adjungatur uxori, postea non dimittat uxorem, sed tribus annis peniteat. *Ibid.* Si vir.

Respondeo, nunquam legi apud veteres, quod nuptiae viduarum, quae continentiam voverunt, irritae fuerint. Neque enim votum earum erat solenne, &c. *Estius in 1 Tim. 5. 12.*

Estius in 1 Tim. 5. 11. Bell. de Monach. l. 2. c. 24.

At *Scotus & Paludanus in 4. dist. 38. & Cajetanus in 2.2. qu. 88. art. 7.* & omnis schola Jureconsultorum, ut refert *Panormitanus* in c. *Rufus*. Qui clerici, vel voverunt, afferunt solo jure Ecclesiastico matrimonium irritum, quod post votum solenne contrahitur. — utraque sententia probabilis est. *Bell. de Mon. l. 2. c. 34.*

that if any marry after a simple vow of continency, the marriage doth stand good, and is not to be dissolved. For this they have a Canon out of *Aufine*, which runs thus; *Some say, that they that marry after a vow, are adulterers: but I say unto you, that they that divide such, doe sinne grievously.* And another out of *Theodorius*, thus; *If a man having a simple vow of virginity, joyne himselfe to a wife, let him not afterwards put her away; but let him doe penance three yeares.*

And so *Estius* confesseth, that we never read in ancient writers, that if Widdowes, who vowed continency, did marry, their marriage was void, and of none effect. For (saith hee) *their vow was not solemne.* But

I have shewed before, that the distinction of *simple* and *solemn* vow hath no ground in Scripture; and that in respect of God, a simple vow doth binde as much as a solemne. And besides, if (as they alledge, and cite some of the antients also for it) one having vowed continency (whether solemnly, or simply) is married unto Christ, and therefore may much lesse marry another, then one that is already married to a mortall man, then surely the marriage of such should much rather be judged adultery, and be dissolved, then the marriage of those, who marry againe, when they are already married. Yet *Bellarmino* goes further, and acknowledgeth that many prime Writers of the Church of *Rome*, as *Scotus*, *Paludanus*, and *Cajetanus*, and generally, as *Panormitanus* doth relate, all the Canonists affirme, that onely by Ecclesiasticall right marriage made after a solemne vow is of no force. And this opinion hee granteth to be probable. So then,

by their own confessions it may appeare, that there is no Law of God against it, but that such as have vowed continency, should marry if they be not able to performe what they have vowed. And this may suffice for this point.

The

The Marquess goes on thus, *we say, Christ descended into Hell, Page 72.*
 and delivered thence the soules of the Fathers: yee deny it. *Wee*
have Scripture for it, viz. Ephes. 4.8. When he ascended up on high,
he led captivity captive, &c. Descending first into the lower part of
the Earth. This lower part of the Earth could not be a grave; for
that was the upper part: nor could it have beene the place of the dam-
ned; for the Devils would have beene brought againe into Heaven.
More clearly Acts 2.37. Then wilt not leave my soule in Hell,
neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption. There is Hell
for his soule for a time, and the grave for his body for a while. Plainer
yet, 1 Pet. 3.18,19. Being put to death in the flesh, but quickned by
the spirit; by which also hee went; and preached unto the spirits in
prison. This prison cannot be Heaven; nor Hell, as it is the place
of the damned: nor the grave, as it is the place of rest. Therefore
it must be (as S. Aug. Epist. 99. ad Evod. faith) some third place:
which third place the Fathers have called Limbus Patrum. Also
Zach. 9.11. As for thee also, by the blood of thy Covenant, I have
sought forth thy prisoners out of the pit, wherein is no water. By this
pit could not be meant the place of the damned; for they have no
share in the Covenant: neither are they Christs prisoners, but the
Devils: neither could this pit be the grave, because Christs grave
was a new pit, where never any was laid before. The Fathers affirm
as much, S. Hieron. in 4. ad Ephes. S. Greg. J. 13. Moral. c. 20. S. Aug. in
Psal. 37.1.

Answer. That Christ did descend into Hell in that sense, as they
 of the Church of Rome doe hold, viz. into a Region of Hell
 called *Limbus Patrum*, to deliver the faithfull thence, that lived
 and died under the old Testament, this Protestants deny; and
 they have just cause to deny it. For the Scripture doth not shew
 us any such Hell as this, which they speake of, much lesse that
 CHRIST did descend into it. 1. The faithfull that were before
 Christ, did enjoy the benefit of him, as well as they that are
 since his comming. *We believe (said Peter) that through the*
grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, wee shall be saved even as they. Acts
15.11. Therefore they were saved by Christ, as well as we now
are saved by him: and consequently the faithfull then through
Christ did goe to Heaven, as well as now they doe. 2. It is said of
the faithfull of the old Testament, that they confessed that they

were

* No is less true
 in the Marquess
 his writing, but
 we I suppose by
 his fault.

were strangers and pilgrims upon the Earth. Heb. 11. 13. and that they did seek a country, v. 14. not an earthly country, but a better country, that is an Heavenly; and that God did prepare for them a City, v. 16. 3. *Abrahams bosome* (as the place is called, where the soules of the Saints of the old Testament were) is so described in the Scripture, as that it could be no such place as they call *Limbus Patrum*. For 1. The soule of *Lazarus* was carried thither by Angels; and therefore it should rather be Heaven then Hell. 2. It was a place of comfort, *Luke 16. 25*. But * *Austine* could not finde (hee saith) with all his searching, where the Scripture doth make Hell to be any place of comfort; and hee thought this a good argument why *Abrahams bosome* could not be Hell. 3. There was a great gulf fixed betwixt the place where *Lazarus* was, viz. *Abrahams bosome*, and the place where the rich man was in torment, *Luke 16. 26*. And hence also † *Austine* inferreth, that *Abrahams bosome* is no part, or member as it were of Hell. This (hee saith) doth in his opinion sufficiently appeare by these words, *betwixt us and you there is a great gulf fixed*, *Luke 16. 26*. * *Bellarmino* therefore doth abuse his Reader, when he saith, that *Austine* here may seeme to doubt whether *Abrahams bosome*, where the soules of the Fathers in times past were, was in Hell, or some where else.

* Nondum inveni, & adhuc quæro, nec mihi accurrit inferos alicubi in bono posuisse Scripturam duntaxat Canonicam: non autem in bono accipendum. *Aug. de Civ. Dei* lib. 20. c. 15. *Abrahæ*, & illi requie, quod ab Angelis pius pauper ablatum est, nescio utrum quisquam possit audire, *Aug. de Gen. ad lit.* l. 12. c. 33.

† In his ipsis tanti magistri verbis, ubi ait dixisse Abraham, Inter vos & nos chaos magnum firmatum est, satis, ut opinor, appareat, non esse quandam partem, & quasi membrum inferorum tantæ felicitatis finem. *Aug. Epist. 99.* * *Augustinus* etsi in *Epist. 99.* ambigere videatur, an sinus Abraham, ubi erant animæ Patrum olim, in inferno esset, an alibi; tamen in lib. 20. de *Civ. Dei* c. 15. affirmat in inferno fuisse. *Bell. de Christi animâ* l. 4. c. 11.

Augustinus *Epist. 99.* disputando colligit, sinum Abraham non fuisse aliquam inferni partem. *Jansen. Concord.* cap. 97.

Et *Augustinus* lib. 9. *Confess.* loquens de *Nebridio* dicit, Quicquid illud est, quod sinus Abraham vocatur, ibi *Nebridius* meus vivit. *Jansen. Ibid.*

Jansenius is much more ingenious, who confesseth that *Austine* by disputing the point did gather, that *Abrahams bosome* was no part of Hell. And hee observes also that *Austine* makes the faithfull that died since *Christ*, to be in *Abrahams bosome*, whereas their *Limbus Patrum* they hold to have bene onely for the faithfull that were

before *Christ*. Neither is it true, which *Bellarmino* saith, that *Austine*

Austine elsewhere affirmeth *Abrahams* *boſome* to have beene in Hell. For *Austine* in the place which *Bellarmino* citeth, onely ſaith, *If it ſeeme not abſurdly to be believed*; ſo that where *Austine* ſpeakes doubtfully, there *Bellarmino* makes him to determine; and where hee doth determine, there *Bellarmino* makes him to ſpeake doubtfully. 4. That argument, which

Bellarmino uſeth to prove that now in the time of the new Teſtament the ſoules of the godly goe to Heaven, is alſo of force in reſpect of thoſe in the time of the old Teſtament. God (ſaith hee) *is not more prone to puniſh, then he is to reward. Therefore ſeeing the wicked are now in torments, it doth truly ſeeme equall and reaſonable, that the righteous doe alſo now receive their rewards.* And that the wicked now

when they die, goe preſently to the place of torments, he proves by that *Luke 16.* where it is ſaid, that the rich man immediately after his death was in torments. Now by this reaſon the godly alſo that were before Chriſt, went to Heaven when they died, for that *Luke 16.* ſhewes, that before Chriſt, the wicked, when they died, went to the place of torment. 5. Chriſt ſaid unto the believing Theiſe, *This day ſhalt thou be with mee in Paradife.* Now *Bellarmino* approves of the Expoſition of *Theophylaſti, Ambroſe, Bede,* and others, who by *Paradiſe* here underſtand the Kingdome of Heaven. And ſo is the word *Paradiſe* taken (as *Bellarmino* alſo obſerves) 2 *Cor. 12. 4.* compared with *v. 2.* By this then it appears, that the ſoule of *Chriſt*, when he died, went to Heaven, and conſequently to no ſuch *Limbus*, or part of Hell, as they talke of.

For the places of Scripture, which the *Marqueſſe* alledgeth, firſt that *Ephes. 4. 8, 9.* doth not ſpeake of *Limbus Patrum.*

Cajetane upon the place, by the lower parts of the Earth underſtands the Earth it ſelfe, which is the lower part of the World.

Deus non eſt pronior ad puniendum, quàm ad remunerandum. Quare cum impii jam nunc in tormentis ſint, æquum eſtè videtur, ut etiam juſti præmia ſua percipiant. *Bell. de Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 6.*

Elle autem nunc impios in tormentis Evangelium teſtatur, *Luc. 16. Bell. Ibid.*

Vera ergo expoſitio eſt *Theophylaſti, Ambroſii, Bedæ & aliorum*, qui per *paradiſum* intelligunt regnum cælorum. *Bell. de Sanct. beatitud. lib. 1. cap. 3.*

Ac ſi apertius dixiſſet, quia deſcendit primum ad inferiorem partem mundi, terram. *Caje. in Ephes. 4. 9.*

Alii terram ipsam intelligunt; q d. in infimam mundi partem, quæ est terra. Sensum hunc S. Thom. non reiecit; Cajetan: amplectitur, & Catharin: & Arias:

Pro his facere videtur consequentia, quam Apost. indicat, hujusmodi: Christus ascendit in cælum: ergo prius descendit, &c. Quæ consequentia promptior est, si terram absolute intelligas, quam si quid aliud. Nam ascensio Christi à terrâ in cælum intelligitur. *Est ad loc.*

And *Estius* notes, that besides *Cajetan*, other Romanists also as *Catharinus*, and *Arias* doe embrace this Exposition, and that *Aquinas* doth not reject it. And (as *Estius* also observes) the argument which the Apostle useth in those words, *This that hee ascended, what is it, but that he descended first into the lower parts of the Earth*, this argument, I say, doth much favour that Exposition. This consequence is more easie (saith *Estius*) if you understand the Earth absolutely, then if any thing else: because Christ's ascension from Earth to Heaven is here understood.

And (say I) before Christ could ascend from Earth to Heaven, as hee did, it was necessary that hee should descend from Heaven to Earth, viz. by his Incarnation: but there was no necessity of his descending to *Limbus Patrum* before his ascending into Heaven; for hee might well enough ascend thither, though he did never descend into the other place, suppose such a place

to have beene. *Estius* also notes that some expound there the lower parts of the Earth to be the grave, which is called the heart of the Earth, Mat. 12. 40. And if by the Lower parts of the Earth, some certaine parts of it, which are lower then some other parts,

are to be understood, then most meete it is to understand the Grave, into which CHRIST descended. It is strange that the Marquesse saith, that the Grave was the upper part, and yet a little after saith, Christ's Grave was a new pit. If it were a pit, then was it not the upper part of the Earth, but the lower part of it. *Ezech. 32. 18.* by the neither parts of the Earth are meant Graves, as appeares vers. 23. So in the place objected, Christ's Grave may be called the lower parts of the Earth, that is, one of the lower parts (as *Judg. 12. 7.* its said that *Jeptah* was buried in the Cities of Gilead, that is, in one of the cities) in opposition to the surface, or uppermost part of the Earth, on which we live.

Finally,

Alii de sepulchro exponunt, juxta illud quod Dominus de se dicit Mat. 12. Sicut fuit Jonas, &c. sic erit filius hominis in corde terræ, &c. *Est. Ibid.*

Finally, *Estius* confesseth, that it is not certaine, that there by *the lower parts of the Earth*, is meant a certaine Region of Hell, although hee thinke that Exposition more probable then the other. But that it hath any such probability in it, his reasons doe not evince. For 1. It is not so, as he saith, that the lower parts of the Earth doe most surely signifie Hell, either as they take it here for *Limbus Patrum*, or as usually it is taken for the place of torment. I have shewed out of *Ezech.* 32. 18. how the phrase is otherwise used, viz. for the Grave. Neither doth it appeare that the words are taken in any other sense, *Psal.* 63. 9. which place *Estius* alledgeth; *they shall goe into the lower parts of the Earth*, that is, they shall be taken away out of the Land of the living, as it followes immediately, *They shall fall by the Sword*, &c. 2. *Christ's* descent into Hell in that sense, which the Romanists maintaine, did not (as *Estius* pretends) goe a little before his ascension into Heaven. Neither (which hee urgeth also) doe those words, prove it, *that hee might fill (or fulfill) all things*. For those words (as *Estius* himselfe doth shew) are diversely expounded. Some understand it of *Christ's* fulfilling all things, that were written of him. Others expound it thus, that hee might fill all kinds of men with spirituall gifts. And this sense doth well agree with that *v. 8. Hee gave gifts unto men*: and with that *v. 11. And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, &c.*

The other place which is next cited, viz. *Acts* 2. 27. is indeed more cleare to shew that *Christ's* Soule was for a while left in Hell, but not in that Hell which our adversaries speake of, viz. *Limbus Patrum*. For 1. Some by *Hell* there understand the Hell of the damned. Thus *Aufine* and *Fulgentius* expound it, as *Bellarmino* observes, who also cites for this Exposition *Cyrill*, *Ambrose*, *Eusebius Emisenus*, and *Gregory Nyssen*.

Hieron: & plerique infernum intelligunt, &c. Qui sensus erit non certus, probabilitatem tamen præ cæteris habet. 1. Ex ipsâ phrasi, quâ utitur Apost. nam inferiores partes, i.e. infima terræ, nihil aptius quàm quod nos infernum dicimus, significant. Ut in *Psal.* 62. Introibunt in inferiora terræ. 2. Quia descensus Christi ad inferos Paulò antè præcesserat ipsius in cælos ascensionem. Denique ex eo, quod hîc sequitur, ut impleret omnia. *Est.* *Ibid.*

Ut impleret omnia, de se scripta, ut quidam exponunt. Alii omnia hominum genera spiritualibus donis implenda significari putant. *Est.* ad *Ephes.* 4. 10.

Aug. *Epist.* 99. dicit Christum descendisse ad loca inferni, ubi erant dolores, & tormenta. Et *Fulgentius*, &c. *Beil. de Christi anima lib.* 4. cap. 16.

Aquinas 3. p. q. 52. art. 2. docet Christum per realem presentiam solum descendisse ad Limbum Patrum, &c. At probabile est profecto Christi animam ad omnia loca inferni descendisse. *Bell. Ibid.*

And therefore contrary to the opinion of other Romanists, hee thinkes it probable; that *Christs Soule* did descend to all the parts of Hell. But where doth the Scripture shew that *Christ* descended into any Hell but one? If therefore hee descended

into the Hell of the damned (which yet I doe not say, nor believe that he did) then not into that Hell, which they call *Limbus Patrum*. 2. Those words *Thou wilt not leave my soule in Hell*, as spoken by *David* Psal. 16. and commented upon by *Peter Acts* 2. those words, I say, doe shew that *Hell* there mentioned could neither be the Hell of the damned, nor *Limbus Patrum*; or at least that there is no necessity to expound it of either. For 1. It is spoken of as a great benefit, a matter of joy and rejoycing, that *Christs Soule* was not left in Hell. *Therefore my Heart is glad, and my glory (or Tongue) rejoyced, &c. For thou wilt not leave, &c.* Psal. 16. 9, 10. Acts 2. 26, 27. But they that hold *Christs* descending either into the Hell of the damned, or into *Limbus Patrum*, make him to descend

Patres describunt terrorem gehennæ ac dæmonum in descensu Christi.

Christus fuit in inferno liber, & liberator aliorum, ut omnes Patres clamant. *Bell. ubi supra.*

Respondeo beneficium fuisse animæ Christi, quod celeriter corpori conjungeretur, sicut malum erat ei separatio: & hoc modo beneficium illi fuit liberatio ab inferno, non ratione loci, sed ratione separationis à corpore. *Bell. Ibid.*

as a conquerour, one that went either to triumph over the Devill in his owne place, as it were; or to deliver the soules, that were in *limbus*. Now why should it be accounted such a benefit, such a matter of joy and rejoycing, for one not to be left there, where hee is onely as a conquerour, and deliverer? *Bellarmino* answers, that it was a benefit to *Christs Soule*, that it was quickly joyned againe unto the Body, even as it was evill to the Soule to be separated from the Body. And thus (saith hee) it was a benefit unto him to be delivered from Hell, not in

respect of the place, but in respect of separation from the body. But who seeth not, that by this reason *Christs Soule* might as well be in Heaven, as either in *Limbus Patrum*, or the Hell of the damned? For though *Christs soule* were in heaven, yet it was a benefit unto it to be delivered out of that estate of separation, which it was in. 2. Those words, *Thou wilt not leave my soule in Hell*, were meant of *Christs* Resurrection, as *S. Peter* telleth us,

Acts

Acts 2.31. But *Christs* Resurrection, though it did presuppose his being in Hell, either as Hell is taken for the grave, or for the state of death, yet not as it is taken either for *Limbus Patrum*, or for the place of torment : *Christ* might well enough rise againe, and yet never be in any such Hell as one of these is, and the other is supposed to have beene. 3. *S. Peter* shewes, that *David* in those words, *Thou wilt not leave my soule in Hell*, spake not of himselfe, but of *Christ* ; for that the words being understood of *David*, were not true, but most true, as understood of *Christ*. *Men and Brethren, let mee freely speake unto you concerning the Patriarch David, that hee is both dead and buried, and his Sepulcher remaineth with us to this day. Therefore being a Prophet, &c.* *Acts 2. 29,30,31.* Here by *Dauids* Sepulcher remaning with them unto that day, hee meanes, that *David* was left in that Hell of which he speakes, and so did not speake of himself, but of some other, viz. of *Christ*, who was not left in it. Thus also *S. Paul* having cited the latter part of the Verse, *Thou wilt not suffer thy holy one to see corruption*, hee also to prove that this was meant of *Christ*, and not of *David*, addes, *For David after he had served his own Generation by the Will of God, fell asleepe, and was laid with his Fathers, and saw corruption : But he, whom God raised up, saw no corruption.* *Acts 13.35,36,37.* *David* spake not of himselfe, but of *Christ*, when hee said, *Thou wilt not suffer thy holy one to see corruption* ; because *David* did see corruption, which *Christ* did not see. So *David* spake not of himselfe, but of *Christ*, when hee said, *Thou wilt not leave my soule in Hell* ; because *Dauids* Soule was left in Hell, where *Christs* Soule was not left. This is the Apostles argument ; and hence it necessarily followes, that by Hell cannot be meant either the place of torment, or yet *Limbus Patrum* : Not the place of torment ; for *Dauids* soule was not left in that Hell, it never came in it. Nor yet can that *Limbus* be meant ; for even the Romanists themselves doe hold that it was quite emptied before that time that *Peter* spake ; and therefore *Dauids* soule was not in it then, whereas yet *Peter* signifies, that then it was in that Hell, of which hee spake. By Hell therefore must be meant either the grave, or the state of the dead. *Rufinus* in his Exposition of the *Creed*, observes that in his time the Article of *Christs* de-

Sciendum sanè est, quòd in Ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habetur additum, descendit ad inferna ; sed

scending.

neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo : vis tamen verbi eadem videretur esse in eo, quod sepulchrum dicitur. *Ruffin. in Symb.*

B. Usher of
*Christi descens
into Hell.*

of *Christi* Buriall. And it is observed, that in all the ancient *Creedes*, that were within 600 years after *Christ*, except one which *Ruffinus* followed, if the article of *Christi* buriall were mentioned, then that of his descending into Hell was omitted ; and if his descending into Hell were mentioned, then his buriall is omitted, which argues, that the antients did take these two, viz. *Christi* buriall and his descending into Hell, to import but one thing, or to differ but very little, and therefore thought it sufficient to mention either the one, or the other. It is most evident that the Hebrew word *Sheol*, and so the Greeke *Hades*, which *Psal.* 16. and *Acts* 2. are rendred *Hell*, are often taken

In errore versantur, qui eam vocem (*Sheol*) nunquam sepulchrum designare contendunt. *Genebr. in Symbol. Athanas.*

for the grave. Some of the Romanists deny that *Sheol* is ever so used, but *Genebrard*, who was sometimes Hebrew Professor at *Paris*, doth confesse that they are in an error ; and there are many places

of Scripture to convince them. *Gen.* 42. 38. *If mischiese befall him, &c. you shall bring down my gray hairees with sorrow to Sheol, i. e. the grave.* For to what Hell else should gray hairees goe down ? So *Gen.* 44. 29. and 31. and *1 King.* 2. 6. And *Job.* 17. 13. *If I waite, Sheol is mine House*, that is, the grave, as appears v. 14. *I have said to corruption thou art my Father, and to the Worme, thou art my Mother, and Sister.* So *Psal.* 141. 7. *Our bones lie scattered at the mouth of Sheol, i. e. the grave.* So *Genebrard* upon the place expounds it *juxta Sepulchrum*, i. e. by the grave ; whereas the vulgar Latine hath it *secus infernum*, neare Hell. But what Hell, except the grave, should dead mens bones lie scattered by ? So in many other places ; and in all these places the Greeke version hath *Hades*, so that *Bellarmino* needed not to have made so strange a matter of it as hee doth, that *Henry Stephen* in his great *Theaurus*, should say that *Hades* may be taken for the grave ; neither had he cause to say that *Stephen*

H. Stephanus
in suo magno
Thesaurio in
gratiam Bezae
(ut videretur)

dicit posse accipi pro sepulchro vocem *ad Nov.* sed nullū invenire potuit auctorem, qui ita locutus fuisset. *Bell. de Christi anima.* l. 4. c. 10.

could

could finde no Authour that did use the word in that sense. I have not now *Stepheus Thesaurus* to looke into, but sure I am, that a man of farre lesse reading then *Stephen* was of, might have alledged many examples to that purpose. And for the Hebrew word *Sheol*, *Genebrard* and *Bellarmine* pretend that the *Chaldie* Paraphrast, and the *Rabbines* doe expound it גֵּהִינוֹם *Gehinnom*, which signifies the place where the damned are in torment. But 1. If it were so, this were nothing to that *Limbus* which they contend for. 2. Neither is it true, that those authors doe usually so expound the word. For the *Chaldie* Paraphrast for the most part keepeth the Hebrew word *Sheol* it selfe, onely sometimes it is a little changed שִׁיֹּל *Shiol*; and many times doth hee use the word קְבוּרָה *Kebura*, or כְּבוֹרָה *Kebura*, that is, the Grave, to expresse the Hebrew *Sheol* by; or, which is the same in effect, כִּי כְבוֹרָהָ *Be Keburta*, or בֵּית קְבוּרָה *i. e.* the house of the Grave. As *Job*. 7. 9. and 14. 13. and 17. 13. and 16. *Psal.* 89. 48. and 141. 7. and *Eccles.* 9. 10. In all these places doth the *Chaldie* Paraphrast render the Hebrew word *Sheol* the grave, or the house of the grave; let any Romanist shew that hee renders it so often by that word, which signifies the place of torment, though (as I said before) that were nothing to their *Limbus Patrum*. And thus also doe the *Rabbines* interpret the word *Sheol*, *R. Levi* saith that *Sheol* doth signifie the Grave, and that therefore it is put for Death, 2 *Sam.* 22. 6. So also *R. Nathan Mordecai* in his Hebrew Concordance saith, that the interpretation of *Sheol* is the Grave. *Aben Ezra* also saith the same in his commentary on *Gen.* 37. 35. And moreover he taxeth the vulgar Latine Translatour for interpreting *Sheol* there Hell, supposing him to have meant the Hell of the damned. *Kimchi* likewise saith that those words *Psal.* 16. 10. *thou wilt not suffer thy holy one to see corruption*, are but a repetition of that which went before, *Thou wilt not leave my soule in Hell*. Which shewes that hee tooke *Sheol* (there rendred Hell) for the Grave. It is true, sometimes the *Rabbines*

Bell. Ibid.
Genebr. in Symb.
Athan.

זֶהְנָה קְרָא שְׁאוֹל מוֹת
כִּי הוּא שֵׁם לְקִבְרֵי R. Levi in
2 *Sam.* 22. 6.
פִּירוּשׁוֹ קִבְרֵי R. Nathan de voce
שְׁאוֹל in Concord.
וְשֵׁם הַמָּוֶת אֲבֵן עֶזְרָא Ab. Ezra in *Gen.* 37. 35
וְשֵׁם הַמָּוֶת אֲבֵן עֶזְרָא Ab. Ezra.
Ibid.
כָּפַל עֵינָיו בְּמָלוֹת שְׁאוֹל
Kimchi ad *Dial.* 16. 10.

bines expound *Sheol* by *Gehinmam*, i.e. Hell, the place of torment, but they doe not hold that to be the simple and genuine signification of the word; as appears by *R. Solomon* on *Gen. 37.*

כפשוטו לשון קבר הוא
באבלי אקבר ולא אתנחם
כל ימי ובמדרשו גידתם
R. Sal. ad Gen. 37. 35.

ישבו רשעים לקבר
וברדו לשאולא הוא גיהנום
Kimchi ad Psal. 9. 17.

35. who saith that *Sheol* there, according to the literall Exposition, is the Grave, and that *Jacobs* meaning was, that hee would goe mourning to the Grave, and would not be comforted; but that according to the my-
sticall Exposition, by *Sheol* there is meant *Gehinmam*, the Hell of the damned.

So *Kimchi* upon those words *Psal. 9. 17.*
The wicked shall be turned into Hell, where the Hebrew is *Sheol*, interprets it, *Let the*

wicked be turned into the Grave, and afterwards addes, that mystically there by *Sheol* is understood *Gehinmam*, the place of torment.

Obj. But they say that in these words, *Thou wilt not leave my soule in Hell*, the Grave cannot be meant by Hell, because the Grave is not a place for the soule, but for the body.

Ans. The word *Soule* is sometimes put for the body, or (which is all one) for man considered in respect of the body. As *Gen. 46. 26.* *All the soules that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loines, &c.* There by *soules* are meant bodies, or persons in respect of their bodies; for so generally both Protestants and Romanists doe hold, that not the Soules properly, but the Bodies of children doe proceede from the loines of their Parents. Yea, and sometimes by *Soule* is meant the Body, when the Soule is departed out of it. As *Nam. 19. 13.* *Whosoever toucheth the dead Body of any man, &c.* There the word rendred *dead Body*, is that which *Psal. 16. 10.* and so usually elsewhere is rendred *Soule*. * *Bellarmine* to take away this answer, saith that there is great difference betwixt the Hebrew word *Nepheš*

לנפש
*Dico multum
inter נפש
& נפש in-
teresse. Nam
נפש est gene-

ralissima vox, & significat sine ullo tropo ram animam, quàm animal, imò etiam corpus, ut patet ex plurimis Scripturæ locis. — At Græcum *ψυχή* ut Latinum anima, non est tam generale, ut sine tropo possit accipi pro toto animali. Itaque in Levitico non ponitur pars pro parte, i.e. anima pro corpore, sed vocabulum, quod ipsum corpus significare solet; aut certe ponitur totum pro parte, i.e. vivens pro corpore. At *Act. 2.* ponitur *ψυχή*, quæ animam solam significat. *Bell. de Gbristi animâ l. 4. c. 12.*

and

and the Greeke *Psyche*, both which are rendred soule. For *Nepheß* (hee saith) is a most generall word, and without any trope doth signifie both Soule, and living creature, yea and the Body also. But the Greeke *Psyche* (he saith) and so the Latine *Anima*, is not so generall, as without a trope to signifie the whole living creature. And therefore in * *Leuiticus* (he saith) one part is not put for another, viz. the Soule for the Body, but there is the word that usually signifies the Body it selfe: or the whole is put for the part, that is, the living creature for the Body. But in *Acts* 2. is used the word *Psyche*, which doth signifie the Soule onely. Thus *Bellarmino*; but a pittie it is to see how a learned man, rather then hee will submit to truth, doth plunge himselfe into absurdity, yea more absurdities then one. But to passe by the rest, this is most grosse, that *Bellarmino* doth so distinguish betwixt *Nepheß* and *Psyche*, as if the former sometimes did signifie the whole living creature, or the Body onely, but not so the latter; when as in these very places of *Leuiticus*, which *Bellarmino* doth speake of, viz. *Levit.* 21.1. and 11. as in the Hebrew the word *Nepheß*, so in the Greeke the word *Psyche* is used; and therefore it is apparently false, that the Greeke word *Psyche* doth signifie the Soule onely. Yea, but saith *Bellarmino*, when even *Nepheß* is opposed to flesh, it cannot be taken for flesh. Now here soule is opposed to flesh, his soule was not left in Hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. *Acts* 2. 31. And therefore here by no meanes can signifie a dead body.

* *Levit.* 21. 1. and 11. where also *Nepheß* i. e. Soule, is put for Body, yea for dead Body.

Ἐν ταῖς Ψυχαῖς ἐμάρθουνται.
Levit. 21.1.

καὶ ἐπὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ τέλει ψυχῆς.
ἐκ εἰσληύσεσθαι. *Ibid.* v. 11.

Præterea etiam *Nepheß*, quando oponitur carni, non potest sumi pro carne.—Hic autem anima

opponitur carni, cum dicitur, neque anima relicta est in inferno, neque caro vidit corruptionem. Ergo hoc loco nullo modo tolerari potest *Bezzæ* interpretatio, qui pro anima cadaver intelligi voluit. *Bezz.* *Ibid.*

I answer, that in those words *Acts* 2.31. there is no opposition betwixt *Soule* and *Flesh*, no more then there is an opposition betwixt *Leave* and *Forsake* in those words *Heb.* 13.6. *I will not leave thee, nor forsake thee.* So then notwithstanding any thing that is objected, in those words, *Thou wilt not leave my Soule in Hell*, by *Hell* may be meant the Grave, and by *Soule* the

Body. But if the word *Soule* be taken properly, then by *Hell* is to be understood the power of death, or the state of the dead. And thus doe Romish Writers sometimes expound the word

Per infernum & perditionem significatur status mortuorum, & non solum damnationum, ut nos serè ex his vocibus auditis concipimus, sed in genere status defunctorum. *Janſen. in Prov. 15. 11.*

Ab inferno, id est, è statu mortuorum liberasti. *Genebr. ad Psal. 29. 4. vel. 30. 3.*

Infernus significat totum mortuorum statum. *Genebr. ad Psal. 88. 48.*

dead. Thus generally all that die, whether they be godly, or wicked, are said as in respect of the Body to goe to the Grave, so in respect of the Soule to descend into Hell.

Humana ista lex necessitatis, ut conspectis corporibus ad inferos animæ descendant. Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit. *Hilar. in Psal. 138.*

newtridg.

Hell. As *Janſenius* upon those words *Prov. 15. 11. Hell and destruction are before the Lord*, notes that by *Hell* and *destruction* is signified the state of the dead, not onely of the damned, as wee usually conceive when we heare those words, but the state of all in general, that are departed out of this life. So *Genebrard* expounds that *Psalme 30. 3. Thou hast brought up my Soule from Sheol*, from Hell, as the vulgar Latine reads it; he expounds it, I say, thus, *Thou hast delivered me from the state of the dead*. So likewise the same author upon *Psal. 88. (or 89.) 48. faith, Hell doth signifie the whole state of the*

This is the Law of humane necessity, (saith Hilary) that when mens bodies are buried, their soules descend into Hell; which descent the Lord to prove himselfe true man, did not refuse. The words also of *S. Peter* doe confirme this Exposition, viz. that *Hell*, in

which Christs Soule was, but was not left, is the state of the dead, or the power of death; Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the paines of death, because it was not possible that hee should be holden of it. For David speaketh concerning him, &c. *Acts 2. 24. &c.* To prove that CHR I S T could not be held by death (he still kept under the power of it) *Peter* alledgeth the words of David concerning Christ, *Thou wilt not leave my Soule in Hell*. Therefore Christs not being left in Hell signifies nothing else, but tis not being left under the power of death: and consequently his being in Hell importeth nothing else but his being under the power of death, under which hee was kept for a while, viz. untill his Resurrection. And this may suffice for answer

answer to the Objection from *Act. 2. 17.* The next place Objected is *1 Pet. 3. 18, 19.* of which place I marvell that the Mar-
quesse should say that it is yet plainer then either of the former.

Austine being consulted by *Evodius* about the meaning of that place, confesseth that it did exceedingly puzzle him, and that hee durst not affirme any thing about it. And the Jesuite *Lorinus* in his Commentary upon it, calles it *difficillimum locum*, a most difficult place, and rehearset ten severall Expositions of it. And So *Estius* also upon the place saith, *This place in the judgement almost of all Interpreters is most difficult, and is so diversly expounded, that John Lorinus doth reckon up nine interpretations of it, to which hee addes his own for the tenth; and yet he hath not touched all neither.* And both he

and *Lorinus* note that only *Arias Montanus* did thinke the place easie to be understood, but withall that his Exposition of it is such, as that others will not easily embrace it. For, as they relate, *Arias* by the spirits in prison doth understand those eight persons, that were shut up in the Arke, which was a kinde of prison unto them. *Bellarmino* also upon occasion of this controverſie about *Limbus Patrum*, and Christs descending into Hell, treating of this place of *Peter*, saith that it hath alwayes beene accounted a most obscure place. Some have thought that by *Prison* in those words of *Peter* is meant Hell, the place of torment, and that Christ went and Preached there, and that such, as did then believe were delivered. And thus * *Hilary* seemes to have understood it, who saith, that the Apostle *Peter* doth testifie, that when Christ descended into Hell, exhortation was Preachde also to those that were in the Prison, who had sometimes beene incredulous in the dayes of Noab. For this opinion *Hilary* is taxed (though

resistente Apostolo Petro, descendente in inferna Domino, etiam his, qui in carcere erant, & increduli quondam fuerant in diebus Noe, exhortationem prædicatam fuisse. *Hilar. in Psal. 118. (vel 119.) 81. &c.*

Questio, quam mihi proposuisti ex Epistola Apostoli Petri, solet nos, ut te latere non arbitror, vehementissimè commovere, &c. *Aug. Epist. 99.*
Vides quàm latebrosus sit, & quæ me moveant, ne affirmare hinc aliquid audeam. *Ibid.*

Locus hic omnium penè interpretum judicio difficillimus, idemque tam variè expositus, ut novem ejus interpretationes recenseat Jo. Lorinus, quibus ipse suam addit decimam; tamen nec omnes attingit. *Est. ad 1 Pet. 3. 29.*

Ut autem hic locus, qui semper obscurissimus habitus est, intelligatur, &c. *Bell. de Christi animæ lib. 4. cap. 13.*

* Scit ergo (*David*) exhortationē hanc sanctos quietes in inferno desiderare; scit;

not

* Hilarius distinguit sanctos in inferno quiescentes, i.e. in sinu Abraham rursus positos, ab illis, qui in carcere erant, ut in loco pœnali, vetera adhuc peccatorum suorum

debita luentes; quem locum Purgatorium vocamus. *Est, ubi supra.* Prædicavit—animabus, quæ apud inferos in carcere, velut pœnarum loco, conclusæ detinebantur——Propter peccata sua quoad pœnam adhuc expianda, apud inferos carceri & cruciatibus addicti remanserunt, usque ad Christi Redemptoris adventum. *Est. Ibid.*

not named) by *Bea*, as *Estius* observes, who yet indeavours to excuse *Hilary*, as not meaning by this *Prison* the Hell of the damned, but Purgatory; and in that sense * *Estius* himselfe also doth understand the words of *Peter*, viz. that by the spirits in prison are meant the soules of those that were in paine and torment for the expiating of their sinnes, untill that Christ came, and Preached deliverance unto them. But of Purgatory I shall speake hereafter; in the meane time so much is obtained, that if the place be meant of Purgatory, then not of *Limbus Patrum*, for that place (as they describe it) did much differ from Purgatory, as being a place (they say) in which was no paine or torment.

But it may seeme strange that the Marquesse should alledge *Austine Epist. 99.* as holding that by the prison, which *Peter* speaketh of, is meant *Limbus Patrum*, when as indeed *Austine*

Unde illis justis, qui in sinu Abraham erant, cum ille in inferna descenderet, nondum quid contulerit, inveni, à quibus cum secundum beatificam præsentiam suæ divinitatis nunquam video recessisse. *August. Epist. 99.*

Considera tamen, ne fortè totum illud, quod de conclusis in carcere spiritibus, qui in diebus Noe non crediderant, Petrus Apostolus dicit, omnino ad inferos non pertineat. *Aug. Ibid.*

Bellarmino *Est. loci*
aut. citat.

in that Epistle is much against it. For besides what I have before cited out of that Epistle, hee saith that Christ by the beatificall presence of his Divinity did never depart from those just persons that were in Abraham's bosome, (which the Marquesse saith, is the same place with that called *Limbus Patrum*) and therefore hee did not finde what Christ did for them, when hee descended into Hell. And having considered what hee could of the words of *Peter*, hee rather thought that they did not speake of Hell at all. And therefore by the spirits in prison hee conceived to be meant men, that lived in the dayes of *Noah*, whose soules were in their mortall bodies, as in a prison; to which men, hee saith, Christ by his Spirit in *Noah* did Preach, though they yet neverthelesse would not believe. *Bellarmino* and *Estius* and others doe acknowledge this

to have beene the opinion of *Ausfine* in that Epistle concerning the words of *Peter*. And *Bellarmino* also doth confesse, that this of *Ausfine* doth differ but little from *Bezaes* Exposition of the place, viz. that by the spirits in prison are meant the soules of men, which were now, when *Peter* wrote of them, in prison, that is, in Hell, to which men Christ by his Divine Spirit in *Noah* did Preach, when they were alive upon Earth. And surely any that are impartiall, will judge this Exposition in that,

wherein it differs from *Ausfines*, the more probable: and yet *Bellarmino*, to shew his partiality, saith that hee would not have refuted *Ausfines* Exposition, if *Ausfine* him- selfe had beene altogether pleased with it.

Ausfines Exposition is embraced not onely by *Beda*, whom *Bellarmino* onely mentions as herein following *Ausfine*, but also by *Aquinas*, and others, as *Estius* observes, who also addes that *Hesselius* (a Romish Authour) doth understand the place much after the same manner. And, as *Lorinus* doth relate, *Diegus Lorin*, in 1 *Pet. Pivva*, one that wrote in defence of the Councell of *Trent*, doth 3. directly expound the words of *Peter* as *Beza* doth, though hee would not have it thought that *Pivva* did receive his Exposition from *Beza*. But against both *Ausfines* and *Bezaes* Exposition it is objected first, that

the Spirit by which Christ went and Preached to the spirits in prison, 1 *Pet.* 3. 18, 19. is opposed to the *Flesh*; and therefore must

signifie Christs Soule, and not his Divine Nature. I answer, that Christs Divine Nature is most fitly understood there by the word *Spirit*, even as by the word *Flesh* is to be understood not onely his Body, but his whole humane Nature, in respect of which nature Christ was put to death, and was quickned by his Divine Nature. Thus doth *Oecumenius* ex-

pound it, Put to death in the nature of flesh, that is, the humane Nature, and raised againe by the power of the Divine Nature. And why should this Exposition seeme strange,

Hanc Expositionem non refutarem, si ipsi Augustino placeret omnino, &c. *Bell. ubi supra.*

Prima expositio est Augustini Epist. 99. ad Evod. quem sequitur Beda. *Bell. Ibid.*

Sequitur hanc Expositionem Beda in Comment. & Thomas 3. q. 52. ar. 2. ad 3. cum paucis aliis. Non dissimilis sententia est Jo. Hesselii, &c. *Est. ad 1 Pet. 3. 19.*

Spiritus, qui hic distinguitur contra carnem, non videtur posse significare aliud quam animam; &c. *Bell. loc. citat.*

Θανατοῦ ἐν τῇ φύσει τῆς σαρκὸς, τῆς τῇ ἀνθρώπινῃ ἀν-
τας δὲ τῇ θείᾳ τῆς θεότητος.
Oecum. ad loc.

when as *Flesh* is put for Christs humane Nature, *Job. 1. 14. The word was made Flesh.* And so also *Rom. 1. 3. and 9. 5.* And therefore on the other side the word *Spirit* may well denote Christs Divine Nature. For this Exposition *Esquius* also cites *Aufine*, and *Athanasius* as alledged by *Bede*. And he doth well observe, that this sense agrees with that which is said of Christ, *2 Cor. 13. 4. For though he was crucified through weakenesse, yet hea liveth by the power of God.*

Sed hæc ratio non concludit; nam in Scripturâ passim dicitur vivificari id, quod non occiditur. 1. Reg. 27. Virum & mulierem non vivificabat David; i. e. non relinquebat vivum. Bell. de Chr. anl. 4. c. 13. ubi etiam alia istiusmodi exempla offert.

חַיִּים
vivificare.

Quid magnum, si anima Christi, moriente carne, vivens permanfit; quando nec in pessimis hominibus anima moritur ut quæ naturâ sit immortalis. *Est. ad 1. Pet. 3. 18.* Proinde melius, intelligitur Christus vivificatus spiritus, i. e. animâ: quia factus est in spiritum vivificantem, hunc scil. quando à morte Resurrexit ad vitam immortalem. *Est. Ibid.*

Besides, if wee should reade quickened in the Spirit, and by Spirit understand Christs Soule, it would follow, that Christs Soule was sometime dead. This was *Aufines* argument against that Exposition, as is observed by *Ballarmine*. Who saith that the argument doth not conclude; for that often in the Scripture that is said to be quickened, which is not put to death. But his answer

is not satisfactory. For though it is true, that in the Scripture to quicken or to make alive is sometimes no more then to preserve and keepe alive; as *1 Sam. 27. 11.* and *2 Sam. 8. 2.* where both in the Originall, and in the vulgar Latine the word used doth signifie to make alive. Yet nevertheless nothing in Scripture is said to be made, that is, kept alive, but that which is obnoxious unto death, and may die: but Christs Soule, and generally the Soules of men are of an immortall nature, and doe not die, when the body dyeth. Besides, what great matter was it (as *Esquius* observes) if when Christs Body died, his Soule did remaine alive; when as even in the worst men that are, the soule doth not die, as being by nature immortall? And therefore hee saith it is better understood thus, Christ was quickened in the Spirit, that is, hee was made a quickning Spirit, viz. when hee rose from death unto life immortall. And hee cites that *1 Cor. 15. 45. The first man Adam was*

made a living Soule; the last Adam was made a quickning spirit. But that sense will not well suite the words of *Peter*, which doe not shew what Christ is made being risen againe, but in what

respect and by what meanes hee did rise againe, viz. by the spirit, that is, by his Divine Nature, as in the flesh, that is, his humane Nature hee was put to death. But againe it is objected, that *S. Peter* saith *Christ went and preached to the spirits in prisons*; therefore it is meant of the soule, not of his Divine Nature, in which respect it cannot be said but improperly that hee went. I answer, there is no necessity to take it properly in the words of *Peter*, more then in the words of *Paul*, *Ephes. 2. 17.* when hee saith that *Christ came and Preached peace unto the Ephesians*; which must be meant of coming and Preaching by the Apostle; for otherwise *Christ* in his owne person did not come and preach unto them. And thus *Estius* notes it to be expounded by *Ambrose*, the Interlineary Glosse, *Aquinas*, *Lyra*, and *Cajetane*. It is objected againe, that by *spirits in prison* cannot be understood living men, except *S. Peter* should on purpose speake improperly and obscurely. I answer, according to *Bezaes* Exposition, (which in his particular doth differ from *Austines*; and is the more probable) not living men, but the soules of men separated from their bodies, are termed *spirits in prison*, as being in the prison of Hell when *Peter* wrote of them; though they were not so, but were joynd to their bodies, and so both soules and bodies joynd together were living men, when *Christ* preached unto them. But *Bellarmino* further objects that *1 Pet. 4. 6.* where it is said, that the Gospel was preached to the dead, which hee will have so understood, as that men being dead, and departed out of this life, the Gospel was Preached unto them. But the true and genuine meaning of the words rather is this, that the Gospel was Preached to them, that are now dead; though they were not dead, but alive when the Gospel was preached unto them. Even as in the verse immediately going before it is said, that *Christ will judge both the quick and the dead*, that is, those that are now alive, or shall be alive at *Christs* comming; and those that are now dead, or shall be dead at *Christs* comming; who yet

Illud, veniens predicavit, si de anima intelligatur, proprie accipi poterit: vere enim venit ad locum, ubi non erat: at si de Divinitate, non potest accipi nisi improprie. *Bell. loc. cit.*

Per spiritus, qui in carcere erant, non videtur posse intelligi homines viventes, nisi de industria S. Petrus affectaverit improprietatem, & obscuritatem. *Bellarmino supra.*

Bell. Ibid.

yet shall not be judged whiles they are dead, but they shall be raised up, and made alive, and so be judged. As therefore *Peter* calles them dead, because so they are now, and were, when hee wrote of them, though they shall not be dead, but alive, when they shall be judged. So for the same reason hee calles them dead, to whom the Gospell was preached, though when the Gospell was preached unto them they were alive, and not dead. And in like manner hee calles them *spirits in prison*, to whom *Christ* went and Preached, because so they were when hee wrote, though they were not so when *Christ* went and

Augustinus servat textum, ut invenit à majoribus Scriptum : Beza pro sua audaciâ mutat, & ubi nos habemus, Qui in carcere erant, ipse vult legi, Qui in carcere sunt. *Bell. loc. cit.*

τοῖς ἐν φυ-
λάκι πνέ-
μασι.

Originall there is neither *that were*, nor *that are*, but the words are : as our Translatours render them) *the spirits in prison* ; so that either the words *that were*, or *that are*, may be understood,

Quamvis nonnulli (sunt) supplementum putent, multo tamen melius noster interpres, ut alii fere omnes (erant) suppleverant. Nam verbum præteriti temporis (prædicavit) supplementum postulat temporis confimilis, erant, vel fuerant, eo scilicet tempore, quo prædicavit. *Est. ad loc.*

preached unto them. But *Bellarmino* chargeth *Beza* with being so bold as to change the Text, because where they read, *the spirits that were in prison*, hee reades, *the spirits that are in prison*. But, as *Bellarmino* himselfe could not but confesse, in the as the sense will beare. *Estius* confesseth that some (I suppose, he meanes some not Protestants) understand, *that are* : but hee holds it better to understand, *that were*, as the verbe is of the Pretertense, *preached*. But this reason is of no moment. For if because the word *Preached* hath reference to the time past, therefore it must be meant of

the Spirits that were in prison, when *Christ* Preached unto them : by the same reason when it is said that *Christ* shall judge both the quick and the dead, because *shall judge* doth respect the time to come, therefore also it must be meant of those that shall be dead, when *Christ* shall judge them. But this doth not follow, and so neither doth the other. And thus, I hope, it may appear, that those words of *Peter* make nothing for *Limbus Patrum*. The fourth and last place of Scripture, which is alledged by the *Marquess* is *Zach. 9. 11.* where *the pit* that is spoken of, hee saith, cannot be the place of the damned, nor the Grave. But what then ? must it therefore be *Limbus Patrum* ? It doth

doth not follow ; for by the pit there may be something else meant then either the place of the damned , or the Grave , or *Limbus Patrum*, viz. the Babylonish captivity, as the Rabbines upon the place expound it. *Bellarmino* citing *Calvin* for this Exposition saith, that it hath no probability, because immediately before there is a prophecy of Christ, *Rejoyce greatly O Daughter of Sion, behold thy King commeth unto thee, &c.* Therefore (saith he) how should these things cohere, if the captivity of Babylon were spoken of ? I answer, well enough ; the Prophet having told them of *Christs* comming unto them, might well presently after speak of their deliverance out of captivity, as a great benefit which they had already obtained through Christ (*in whom all the promises are yea, and in him amen*, 2 Cor. I. 20.) and whereby they might be assured of far greater benefit by him, even of deliverance from the captivity of sinne and Satan. *Estius* in his Exposition of the hard places of Scripture, treating of this place, saith indeed that many understand it of Christs descending into Hell, and delivering thence the soules of the just ; but withall hee tells us, that it is diversly expounded, and that one Exposition is, that *Christ by the Merit of his Passion did free all the Eleſt, who were held captive under the power of the Devill. And thus* (hee saith) *the pit, wherein is no water, is the captivity of mankinde, in which so long as it is held, it is empty of the Water of Divine Grace.* Diverse Romanists doe cite *Hierome* as interpreting this place of the Prophet *Zachary*, of *Limbus Patrum*, and of Christs descending thither : But they that peruse *Hieromes* owne words, will finde, that hee neither speakes of Christs descending, nor of *Limbus Patrum* ; and that indeed hee meant onely that which *Estius* expreſſeth. Hee giveth, the sense of the Prophets words thus ; *By the blood of thy passion, thou through thy clemency haſt delivered those, who were held bound in the prison of Hell, in which there is no mercy.* And hee addes

R. Sal. Kimchi
and Abrabneel.
Bell. de chr. au. l.
4. c. 11.

Quomodo ergo ista cohererent, si
de captivitate Babylonicâ ageretur ?
Bell. Ibid.

Variè hoc exponitur — Unus sensus
est, Christum per Meritum Passionis
suis omnes electos suos, qui teneban-
tur tanquam vincti sub potestate dia-
boli, liberasse. — Sic lacus, in quo
non est aqua, est captivitas humani
generis, quâ quamdiu detinetur, va-
cuum est ab aquâ Divinæ gratiæ. Est.
ad Zach. 9. 11.

Bell. loco proxi-
mè citato.
Ribera ad loc.
Annotas. on the
Downy Trans-
lation.

Quod ita intelligitur ; In sanguine
passionis tuæ, eos, qui vincti in car-
cere tenebantur inferni, in quo non
est ulla misericordiâ, tuâ clemenciâ
liberasti. — In hoc lacu inferni
morabatur dives ille quondam pur-

puratus, cuius lingua magniloqua pænarū exurebatur incendiis; & in tantū non habebat ulla aquarum refrigeria, ut extremi digiti pauperis tincti in aquā refrigerium postularēt. *Hieron. ad Zach. 9. 11.*

a little after, that the rich man spoken of *Luke 16.* was in that pit, which was so void of all water of comfort, that hee desired *Lazarus* might but dip the tip of his finger in water to coole his Tongue. Here it is evident, that *Hierome* by the pit without ma-

ter understands the Hell of the damned, which is without all comfort, though the Marquesse say that place cannot here be meant. Now whereas *Hierome* saith that *Christ* by his Passion did deliver those that were bound in that prison, I suppose hee did not meane, that any being once in Hell, as that rich man that he mentioneth, were afterwards delivered out of it; himself seemes to exclude that sence, when hee saith, that in that prison there is no mercy, viz. to be obtained: but his meaning was, that such, as by reason of sinne were in the state of damnation, *Christ* did deliver by his Passion. But thus neither this place of *Zachary*, nor any other place of Scripture doth prove a *Limbus Patrum*, or that *Christ* descended into Hell in that sence as they of the Church of *Rome* maintaine. For the Fathers, whom the Marquesse citeth, *Aufine* in *Psalm. 37. 1.* hath nothing about *Limbus Patrum*, or *Christ*s descending into Hell; and I have shewed before that he gathered by the Scripture, that *Abraham*s bosome, was no such *Limbus*, as the Romanists imagine: yea, that hee held the Saints that died before *Christ*s incarnation to have alwayes enjoyed the beatificall presence of *Christ*s Divinity, which is point

blankē contrary to their opinion. *Hierome*, I grant, in *Ephes. 4. 9.* seemeth to speake for them, where hee saith, *By the lower parts of the Earth is understood Hell, to which our Lord and Saviour descended, that he might victoriously carry with him so Heaven the soules of the Saints, which were kept there. Whereupon also after his Resurrection many bodies of the just were seene in the holy City.*

But *Hieromes* meaning might be onely this, that *Christ* by the vertue and efficacy of his death, did deliver the Soules of all Saints (whether before or after his coming

Inferiora autem terræ infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit, ut sanctorum animas, quæ ibi tenebantur inclusæ, secum ad celos victor abduceret. Unde & post Resurrectionem ejus, plurima corpora iustorum in sanctâ civitate visa sunt. Hieron. ad Eph. 4. 9.

Ascendens quippe in altum, captivam duxit captivitatem. Nos qui nunc in Christum credimus de gentibus congregati, cum essemus creatura Dei,

ming) from Hell, which otherwise by reason of sinne was the place that did belong unto them. Thus a little before upon those words, *when hee ascended up on high, hee led captivity captive*, Hierome doth expresse himselfe, saying, *Wee, who now believe in Christ, were taken captive by the Devil, and were delivered over to his officers. Therefore our Lord Iesus Christ came, bringing with him the vessels of captivity, and preached remission to those that were taken, and deliverance to those that were bound; and delivered us from the Chaines, and Fetters of our enemies. And having deliver'd us, and by a new captivity brought us out of our old captivity, he carried us with him into Heaven.* Hee cannot here meane, that we were actually in Hell, and then from thence, delivered, and carried up with Christ into Heaven. But his meaning must needs be this, that whereas sinne had brought us under condemnation, so that nothing but Hell did remaine for us, Christ by his death delivered us, and made a way for us into Heaven, into which otherwise wee could finde no entrance. After the same manner very well may the other words be understood so as to import no such place as they call *Limbus Patrum*. However hee meant, yet it appeares sufficiently by the words of *Austine* before cited, that the opinion of *Limbus Patrum* was not generally received in that time wherein Hierome lived, *Austine* and hee being contemporaries. The other Father yet remaining, is *Gregory*, but there is no such place as that mentioned, viz. li. 13. Mor. ca. 20. for that booke hath onely 17. Chapters in it: yet I finde *Bellarmino* also to cite *Gregory* after the very same manner, yea and to bid us also see *Cap. 21.* But the words, which *Bellarmino* citeth as out of *Cap. 20.* are indeed in *Cap. 15.* viz. *While our Master and Redeemer penetrating the cloysters of Hell, did bring out from thence the soules of the Elect, hee suffers not us to goe thither, from whence by descending hee did deliver others.*

à diabolo capti sumus, & ejus satellitibus distributi. Venit igitur Dominus noster Iesus Christus, secundum Ezechielem, vasa captivitatis secum apportans, & aperto capite (ne ab adversariis cognosceretur) prædicavit his, qui capti erant, remissionem, & qui tenebantur in vinculis solutionem, & nos de catenis hostium, & de compedibus liberavit. Hieron. ad Ephes. 4. 8.

Liberatosque nos, & per novam captivitatem de captivitate veteri erutos, secum duxit in cælum. Ibid.

Bell. de Christ.
anim. l. 4. c. 14.

Dum conditor ac redemptor noster claustra inferni penetrans, electorum exinde animas eduxit, nos illo ire non patitur, unde per alios descendendo liberavit. Gregor. Moral. lib. 13. cap. 15.

Priores etenim sancti & sustinere adversa poterant, & ramen à corporibus educti, adhuc ab inferni locis liberari non poterant: quia necdum venerat, qui illuc sine culpâ descenderet, ut eos, qui ibi tenebantur ex culpâ, liberaret. *Ibid.* c. 16.

These words of Gregory might admit of the same Exposition with those of Hierome before spoken of, but that in the next Chapter he is more plaine saying, *The former Saints could indure adversity, but yet they could not be delivered from Hell, when they died, because hee was not yet come, who should*

descend thither without sinne, that hee might deliver those, who were held there by reason of sinne. But the reason that Gregory here giveth, is too weake; for though Christ were not then come in the flesh, yet his death was as effectual to those, that believed in him, then, as after his comming, as I have proved before. Neither is the ground or occasion of these words of Gregory good; for hee buildes or comments upon that of Job 17. 13. *If I waite, Sheol (Hell, as Gregory understands it) is mine house.* But I have shewed before, that *Sheol* doth not properly signifie Hell, as either wee, or our adversaries usually take the word, but the Grave, or the state of the dead. And so the Chaldie Paraphrast there for *Sheol* hath that which signifieth the house of the Grave. This appeares to be the meaning in that place by that which followes immediately after, v. 14. *I have said to corruption, Thou art my Father, to the Worme, thou art my Mother and Sister.* If our adversaries wil yet stand upon the authority of Gregory, I answer, that we are not tied to the authority of any in this kinde, further then they concur with the Scripture: and if we were, yet *Austines* authority were to be preferred, as being 200 years more ancient then Gregory; but of this point enough.

כו קבורת

Page. 73.

From *Limbus Patrum* wee must now passe to *Purgatory*, to which the Marquesse doth next leade us. We hold (saith hee) *Purgatory* fire, where satisfaction shall be made for sinnes after death: you deny it. We have Scripture for it, 1 Cor. 3. 13, 15. *The fire shall try every mans worke, of what sort it is; if any mans worke shall be burnt, hee shall suffer losse, but hee himselfe shall be saved, yet so as by fire.* S. Aug. so interprets this place upon Psal. 37. also S. Ambrose upon 1 Cor. 3. and ser. 20. in Psal. 118. S. Hier. l. 2. c. 13. advers. Joann. S. Greg. l. 4. dial. c. 39. Origen Hom. 6. in cap. 15. Exod.

If there be any such place as *Purgatory*, it doth much more concerne

concerne us then *Limbus Patrum*, which they hold to have been made void, and of no use long agoe, but this they pretend to continue still, and to be of as much force as ever it was. But we finde nothing in Scripture to prove any such place, or any such fire, as that of *Purgatory*, wherein they that have not fully satisfied for their finnes in this life, must lie, and fric, untill they have made full satisfaction, and then be taken out, and conveyed to Heaven. For therefore they call the place *Purgatory*, and the fire *Purgatory fire*, because (they say) in that place, by that fire the Soules are purged, which were not fully purged in this life, that being so purged, they may have entrance into Heaven. But how doth this agree with the Scripture?

That tells us, that the *Blood of Jesus Christ* cleanseth us from all sinne; 1 Joh. 1. 7. And that if any man sinne, wee have an advocate with the Father, *Jesus Christ the righteous*; And he is the propitiation for our finnes. 1 Joh. 2. 1, 2. It is onely Christ, who by his blood doth satisfie for our finnes, and so purge us from them; we cannot doe it by any thing, which we either doe or suffer in this life, much lesse is it to be done by us hereafter when we are dead. God doth indeed afflict his children here in this World; thereby to purge them; *By this shall the iniquity of Jacob be purged, and this is all the fruit to take away his sinne.* Isai. 27. 9. But this affliction is onely castigatory, not satisfactory. When we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the World. 1 Cor. 11. 32. After this life is ended, there remains no more affliction for the godly, for any thing that we can finde in Scripture. Wee know, that if our earthly house of this *Tabernacle* were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternall in the Heavens. — Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whiles wee are at home in the body, wee are absent from the Lord. For we walke by Faith, and not by sight. We are confident, I say, willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. 2 Cor. 5. 1, 6, 7, 8. The Apostle speakes there not peculiarly of himselfe, or such eminent ones as he was, but generally of all Believers, as appears by those words, *For we walke by faith, and not by sight*; Which

Vocatur Purgatorium locus quidam, in quotanquam in carcere post hanc vitam purgantur animæ, quæ in hac non plenè purgatæ fuerunt, ut nimirum sic purgatæ in cælum ingredi valeant, quò nihil intrabit coinquinatam. *Bell. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 1.*

Priores etenim sancti & sustinere adversa poterant, & ramen à corporibus educi, adhuc ab inferni locis liberari non poterant: quia necdum venerat, qui illuc sine culpâ descenderet, ut eos, qui ibi tenebantur ex culpâ, liberaret. *Ibid.* c. 16.

These words of Gregory might admit of the same Exposition with those of Hierome before spoken of, but that in the next Chapter he is more plaine saying, *The former Saints could indure adversity, but yet they could not be delivered from Hell, when they died, because hee was not yet come, who should*

descend thither without sinne, that hee might deliver those, who were held there by reason of sinne. But the reason that Gregory here giveth, is too weake; for though Christ were not then come in the flesh, yet his death was as effectuell to those, that believed in him, then, as after his comming, as I have proved before. Neither is the ground or occasion of these words of Gregory good; for hee buildes or comments upon that of Job 17.13. *If I waite, Sheol (Hell, as Gregory understands it) is mine house.* But I have shewed before, that Sheol doth not properly signifie Hell, as either wee, or our adversaries usually take the word, but the Grave, or the state of the dead. And so the Chaldie Paraphrast there for Sheol hath that which signifieth the house of the Grave. This appeares to be the meaning in that place by that which followes immediately after, v. 14. *I have said to corruption, Thou art my Father, to the Worme, thou art my Mother and Sister.* If our adversaries wil yet stand upon the authority of Gregory, I answer, that we are not tied to the authority of any in this kinde, further then they concur with the Scripture: and if we were, yet *Anstines* authority were to be preferred, as being 200 years more ancient then Gregory; but of this point enough.

Page. 73.

From *Limbus Patrum* wee must now passe to Purgatory, to which the Marquesse doth next leade us. *We hold (saith hee) Purgatory fire, where satisfaction shall be made for sinnes after death: you deny it. We have Scripture for it, 1 Cor. 3. 13, 15. The fire shall try every mans worke, of what sort it is; if any mans worke shall be burnt, hee shall suffer losse, but hee himselfe shall be saved, yet so as by fire.* S. Aug. so interprets this place. upon Psal. 37. also S. Ambrose upon 1 Cor. 3. and ser. 20. in Psal. 118. S. Hier. l. 2. c. 13. advers. Joann. S. Greg. l. 4. dial. c. 39. Origen Hom. 6. in cap. 15. Exod.

If there be any such place as Purgatory, it doth much more concerne

concerne us then *Limbus Patrum*, which they hold to have been made void, and of no use long agoe, but this they pretend to continue still, and to be of as much force as ever it was. But we finde nothing in Scripture to prove any such place, or any such fire, as that of *Purgatory*, wherein they that have not fully satisfied for their sinnes in this life, must lie, and fric, untill they have made full satisfaction, and then be taken out, and conveyed to Heaven. For therefore they call the place *Purgatory*, and the fire *Purgatory fire*, because (they say) in that place, by that fire the Soules are purged, which were not fully purged in this life, that being so purged, they may have entrance into Heaven. But how doth this agree with the Scripture?

Vocatur Purgatorium locus quidam, in quo tanquam in carcere post hanc vitam purgantur animæ, quæ in hac non plenè purgatæ fuerunt, ut nimirum sic purgatæ in cælum ingredi valeant, quò nihil intrabit coinquinatum. *Bell. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 1.*

That tells us, that *the Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sinne*; 1 Joh. 1. 7. And that if any man sinne, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; And he is the propitiation for our sinnes. 1 Joh. 2. 1, 2. It is onely Christ, who by his blood doth satisfie for our sinnes, and so purge us from them; we cannot doe it by any thing, which we either doe or suffer in this life, much lesse is it to be done by us hereafter when we are dead. God doth indeed afflict his children here in this World; thereby to purge them; *By this shall the iniquity of Jacob be purged, and this is all the fruit to take away his sinne.* Isai. 27. 9. But this affliction is onely castigatory, not satisfactory. When we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the World. 1 Cor. 11. 32. After this life is ended, there remains no more affliction for the godly, for any thing that we can finde in Scripture. Wee know, that if our earthly house of this Tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternall in the Heavens. — Therefore we are all wayes confident, knowing that whiles we are at home in the body, wee are absent from the Lord. For we walke by Faith, and not by sight. We are confident, I say, willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord. 2 Cor. 5. 1, 6, 7, 8. The Apostle speaks there not peculiarly of himselfe, or such eminent ones as he was, but generally of all Believers, as appears by those words, *For we walke by faith, and not by sight*; Which

is as true of every believer, as it was of *Paul*. Now if the faithful, when they depart out of this Tabernacle, the body, goe to their house prepared for them in Heaven, and are present with the Lord, and enjoy the sight of him; then surely there is no such thing as Purgatory, to keepe them, I know not how long absent from God, in paine and torment. And so the Scripture tells us, that *they that die in the Lord, are blessed, and rest from their labours. Revel. 14. 13.* But how are they blessed, and how doe they rest from their labours, if yet after they are dead, they must endure Purgatory, the paines whereof, they say, are most grievous, and such as that no paines here in this life are to be compared with them? Yea, some hold that the least paine in Purgatory, is greater then the greatest paine that is in this life. And whereas *Dominicus à Soto* thought that none did continue in Purgatory above ten years, *Bellarmino* confutes this by the custome of their Church praying for those that were known to be dead a hundred or two hundred yeares before. Which argues, that (as they suppose) soules may continue so long in Purgatory. Yea, he cites *Bede*, who lived about 900 yeares agoe, telling of one, to whom was shewed the paines of Purgatory, and it was told him, that all the Soules in Purgatory should be delivered and saved in the day of judgement, &c. whence he infers, that according to *Bede* some now dead (yea that were dead many hundred yeares agoe) must abide in Purgatory untill the day of judgement. And will any call such blessed? will any say that such rest from their labours? In a word, the Scripture tels us but of two places appointed for such as depart out of this life, the one a place of comfort, and the other a place of torment; and withall it tells us, that betwixt these two places there is such a great gulf fixed, that they that are in the one, cannot passe unto the other. *Luke 16. 25, 26.*

Pœnas Purgatorii esse atrocissimas, & cum illis nullas pœnas hujus vitæ comparandas docent constanter Patres. *Bell. de Purgat. lib. 2. cap. 14.*

B. Thomas dicit, minimam pœnam Purgatorii esse majorem maximâ pœnâ hujus vitæ. *Bell. Ibid.* Repugnat Ecclesiæ consuetudo, quæ anniversaria sacra celebrat pro defunctis, etiam si constet eos ante

centum vel ducentos annos esse mortuos. Quod certè non fieret, si Ecclesia crederet, non puniri animas ultra decem annos. *Bell. Ibid. cap. 7.* Scribit *Beda* l. 5. Hist. c. 15. cuidam ostensas fuisse Purgatorii pœnas, dictumque illi esse, animas, quæ in Purgatorio degunt, salvandas omnes in die judicii, &c. ubi clare indicat, aliquos jam defunctos ulque ad diem judicii mansuros. *Bell. Ibid.*

Neither doe wee want the testimonies of the ancient Fathers for the asserting of this truth, which we maintaine. *Cyprian* saith, that though the godly and the wicked fare alike here, yet when this life is ended, then their estates doe much differ. *We are contained* (saith hee) *for a while both good and bad in one house; whatsoever doth happen within the house, we suffer alike, untill this temporall life being ended, we are divided to the habitations either of eternall death, or of immor-*

tality. Hee makes no third place distinct from those of immortality, and of everlasting death; neither doth hee make any stay after the end of this life, but that such as escape the habitation of endlesse death, doe immediately passe to the habitation of immortality. So the same Father againe.

The Kingdome now is very neare at hand, &c. now after earthly things follow heavenly, after small things great, after fading things eternall. What place is there here for anxiety and carefullnesse? who can now be fearfull, and sad, but he that hath neither hope, nor faith?

For it is for him to feare death, who is not willing to goe to Christ: and it is for him to be unwilling to goe to Christ, who doth not believe that he beginsse to reigne with Christ. For it is written, that the just doth live by faith. If thou beest just, if thou dost live by faith, if thou dost indeed believe in God; why being to be with Christ, and being sure of the Lords promise, dost thou not embrace this, that thou art called unto Christ; and reioyce that thou art freed from the Devil?

Thus in a time of mortality did Cyprian comfort and encourage Christians against the feare of death. But how will all this consist with Purgatory? How is the Kingdome of God so nigh at hand? how doe things heavenly and eternall succede things earthly and fading, if after this life the soules of Christians may continue many hundred years perhaps

Quamdiū enim corpus hoc permanet commune cum cæteris sic necesse est & corporalis conditio communis, nec separari generi humano ab invicem datur, nisi istinc de seculo recedatur. Intra unam domum boni & mali interim continemur: quicquid intra domum venerit, pari sorte perpetimur; donec ævi temporalis fine completo, ad æternæ vel mortis, vel immortalitatis hospitia dividamur. Cyprian. ad Demetrian.

Regnum Dei, fratres dilectissimi, caput esse in proximo, &c. jam terrenis cælestia, & magna parvis, & caducis æterna succedant. Quis hic anxietatis & sollicitudinis locus? Quis inter hæc trepidus & mæstus est, nisi cui spes & fides deest? ejus est enim mortem timere, qui ad Christum nolle ire: ejus est ad Christum nolle ire, qui se non credat cum Christo incipere regnare. Scriptum est enim, justum fide vivere. Si justus es, & fide vivis, si verè in Deum credis; cur non cum Christo futurus, & de Domini pollicitatione securus, quod ad Christum voceris, amplecteris, & quod Diabolo careas, gratularis? Cyprian. de Mortal.

in the flames of Purgatory before they can get to Heaven ?
Might not this well make every one to feare death , and to

O animula, vagula , blandula, Quæ
nunc abibis in loca ? *Adrian. Im-*
peras.

tremble at the approach of it ? Might
not a Christian at his Death well cry
out with the Heathen Emperour , O
poore Soule, Whither art thou now going ?

* Simeon de-
nique ille ju-
stus, &c. Pro-
bans scil. atque
confessans tunc
esse servis Dei
pacem , tunc
liberam &
tranquillam
quietem, quan-
do de istis
mundi turbu-
lantis extracti,
sedis & securi-
tatis æternæ
portum peti-
mus , quando
expunctâ hâc
morte ad im-
mortalitatem
venimus. *Cypri.*
Ibid.

But * *Cyprian* goes on, and citing that of *Simeon*, *Lord* now let-
test thou thy servant depart in peace ; for mine eyes have seene thy
salvation, he addes, that then the servants of God have peace, then
they have free and calme quietnesse, when being taken out of the tem-
pests of this world, we arrive at the haven of eternall rest and securi-
ty, when as this death being past we come to immortality. And so
againc, God doth promise immortality and eternity unto thee, when
thou goest out of the world ; and doest thou doubt ? This is not at all
to know God : this is to offend Christ the Lord and Master of be-
lievers, with the sinne of unbelieve : this is to be in the Church, the
house of Faith, and yet to have no Faith. How profitable it is to goe
out of the World, Christ himselfe, the Master of our salvation and
welfare doth shew, who when his Disciples were sorrowfull, because
he said he was to leave them, said, If you had loved me, you would
rejoyce because I goe to the Father, (*Joh. 14. 28.*) teaching us, that
we should rather rejoyce then be sorry, when they depart out of the
World, whom we love, Who are dear unto us.

Deus de hoc mundo recedenti tibi immortalitatem, atque æternitatem pollicetur, & tu
dubitas ? Hoc est Deum omnino non nosse ; hoc est Christum credentium Dominum &
magistrum peccato incredulitatis offendere ; hoc est, in Ecclesiâ constitutum fidem in do-
mo fidei non habere. Quantum proficit exire de seculo, Christus ipse salutis atque utilitatis
nostræ magister ostendit : qui cum discipuli ejus contristarentur, quod se jam diceret re-
cessurum, locutus est ad eos dicens, si me dilexissetis, gauderetis, quoniam vado ad Patrem :
docens scil. & ostendens, cum chari, quos diligimus, de seculo exeunt, gaudendum potius
quàm dolendum. *Cyprian. Ibid.*

Lugeatur mortuus, sed ille , quem
gehenna suscipit, quem tartarus de-
vorat, in cujus pœnam æternus ignis
æstuat. Nos quorum exitum ange-
lorum turba comitatur, quibus obviam
Christus occurrit , gravamur magis,
si diutius in Tabernaculo ista mortis

Thus also *Hierome* writing to *Paula* to
comfort her concerning the Death of her
Daughter *Blesilla*, saith , Let the dead be la-
mented, but such an one whom the place of tor-
ment doth receive, whom Hell doth devoure,
for whose punishment the everlasting fire doth
burne

burne. We, whose departure a troupe of Angels doth accompany, whom Christ doth come to meet, are more grieved (or, as some reade *gravemur*, let us be more grieved) if we abide longer in this Tabernacle of death: because so long as we abide here, we are as pilgrimes absent from the Lord. Let that desire possesse us, woe is me, that my pilgrimage is prolonge I, &c. *Austine* plainly saith, that the Catholike faith by Divine authority doth believe the first place to be the Kingdome of Heaven; the second to be Hell, where every apostate, or such as are aliens from the faith of Christ, doe suffer everlasting punishments; a third place we are altogether ignorant of, yea we finde in the holy Scriptures, that there is no such place. *Bellarmino* answers that *Austine* there speaks of those places, which are everlasting. Which indeed is true; for he speaks of Heaven, and of Hell (the place of torment) which are everlasting places for those to abide in, that are in them. But withall hee saith that there is no third place, viz. for those that depart out of this life. Besides, how can the Romanists yeeld that there is no everlasting place besides Heaven, and Hell, viz. *Gehenna* (which is the word that *Austine* useth) the Hell of the damned? when as they hold a *Limbus infantium*, an everlasting place for Infants to abide in, that die without Baptisme: which place they make to be distinct both from Heaven, and from the place of torment. For there (they say) such children as die unbaptized, suffer the punishment of losse, whereby the place differs from Heaven; but not the punishment of sense, whereby it differs from the Hell of the damned. But * *Bellarmino* proves that *Austine*, or whosoever was the Authour of the booke called *Hypognosticon*, did not deny that there is a third place to abide in for a time after this life, because

pognostici, tertium locum temporarium post hanc vitam, ex eo potest intelligi, quod fides Catholica docet præter cælum & infernum fuisse ante Christi passionem sinum Abrahamæ, ubi debebant animæ sanctorum Patrum. *Bell. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 13.*

habitemus. Quia quamdiù hic moramur, peregrinamur à Domino. Ila nos cupido teneat, Hei mihi, quia peregrinatio mea prolongata est, &c. *Hieron. Epist. 25.*

Primum locum fides Catholicorum Divinâ autoritate credit, regnum esse cælorum; secundum gehennam, ubi omnis apostata, vel in fide Christi alienus æterni supplicia experietur; tertium penitus ignoramus, imò nec esse in Scripturis sanctis invenimus. *Aug. in Hypognost. ultra medium.*

Loquitur de locis æternis. *Bell. de Purg. lib. 1. cap. 13.*

Pro pænâ solius damni æternâ est Limbus puerorum. *Bellar. de Purgat. l. 2. c. 6.*

* Quod autem non negaverit Aug. aut quicumque fuit auctor Hy-

the

the Catholike faith doth teach, that besides Heaven and Hell there was before Christs death *Abrahams bosome*, where the soules of the holy Fathers did abide. I answer, that *Abrahams bosome* was any such *Limbus Patrum* as the Romanists imagine, was no part of *Austines* Citede, as I have shewed before out of *Austines* undoubted writings. And therefore *Erasmus*

Ineptè igitur Erasmus ponit in margine ad illa verba [tertium penitus ignoramus] Purgatorium, q. d. Purgatorium est locus tertius, quem ignorat fides Catholica. *Bell. Ibid.*

Nemo certè dubitat Orthodoxus, an Purgatorium sit, de quo tamen apud præcos nulla, vel quàm rarissima mentio: sed & Græcis ad hunc usque diem non est creditum esse. *Rossenf. contra Luther. citat. à Polydor. Vergil. de Invent. l. 8. c. 1.*

(though *Bellarmino* unjustly carpe at him for it) might well write *Purgatory* in the margent over against those words, *a third place we are altogether ignorant of*; signifying that *Purgatory* is a third place, of which the Catholike faith is ignorant. But what neede is there to alledge particular Fathers, when as the Bishop of Rochester, who was beheaded in the reigne of *Henry* the Eighth for maintaining the Popes supremacy, in his booke against *Luther* (as hee is cited by *Polydore Vergill*, who was an agent here in *England* for the Pope in the time of *Henry*

3.) when as (I say) that Authour confesseth, that *Purgatory* is never or very seldome mentioned by the antient writers; and that the Grecians to this day doe not believe that there is any such thing as *Purgatory*. Now for the place of Scripture, which the Marquesse saith they have for *Purgatory*, viz. *1 Cor. 3. 13, 15.* First it is to be observed, that whereas *Bellarmino* doth alledge diverse other places besides this for prooofe of *Purgatory*, the Marquesse waves all the other, and mentiones onely this, conceiving it (as it seemes) more plaine and pregnant then the rest. Yet, 2. *Bellarmino* tells us, and bids us marke it, that this is one of the most obscure places of all the Scripture: though withall hee saith, it is one of the most usefull places, because from thence they have (as hee supposeth) a foundation both for *Purgatory*, and for veniall sinnes. But (as hath beene observed before out of *Austine*) the Scripture is cleare in those things, which concerne faith; and therefore we must not

Nota in primis, locum istum Apostoli, *1 Cor. 3.* esse unum ex difficilissimis, & utilissimis totius Scripturæ. Nam ex eo statuunt Catholici duo Ecclesiastica dogmata, purgatorium, & venialia peccata. *Bell. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 5.*

In iis quæ aperte posita sunt in Scripturis, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moreque viv. nati. *Aug. de doct. Christi. l. 2. c. 9.*

build

build pointes of faith upon obscure places. Now so obscure is this place, viz. 1 Cor. 3. 13, 15. that *Bellarmino* spends a long Chapter merely in the explication of it. And yet when all is done, nothing can be made of it for Purgatory. For *Bellarmino* confutes those that thinke Purgatory to be meant by the fire mentioned, v. 13. *The fire shall try every mans worke of what sort it is*: and he proves, that the fire there mentioned, is the fire of Gods severe and just judgement, which is not a purging and afflicting, but a proving and examining fire. So that *Bellarmino* doth take away one halfe of the Marquesse's quotation; and indeed the whole quotation. For though *Bellarmino* would have those words v. 15. *he himselfe shall be saved, yet so as by fire*, to be understood of Purgatory; yet who seeth not, that it is absurd to take the word *fire* otherwise there then v. 13. And therefore *Estius* upon the place saith, that it is evident, that one and the same fire is meant in both Verses. Which fire hee will have to be that, which shall burne up the World at the last day. So also *Bellarmino* notes some to understand it; as some of the tribulations of this life: and some of everlasting fire. All these Expositions *Bellarmino* relates, and confutes, as justly he may, that being indeed the true Exposition, which hee embraceth, but doth not extend farre enough, viz. that by fire is meant Gods Severe and just judgement, whereby the workes of all must be tried, as it were by fire; though the Apostle there speake peculiarly of Ministers, and of their Doctrine: and so as it were by fire shall they be saved, that adhere to the foundation Christ, though their workes be found like wood, hay and stubble, vaine and unprofitable, so that they suffer losse in that respect, as having no reward nor benefit of those workes. Now whereas the Marquesse saith, that *Austine* interprets this place of Purgatory, in his commentary upon *Psal. 37*. I answer, it is true, *Austine* there doth cite or rather glance at this place, and expound it as meant *de emendatorio igne*, of a purging fire, and saith that this fire is more grievous then any thing that a man can suffer in this life.

Alii intelligunt de penis Purgatorii; sed neque id rectè dici potest. *Bell. de Purgat. l. 1 c. 5.*

Superest igitur, ut dicamus hic Apostolum loqui de igne severi, & iusti iudicii Dei, qui non est ignis purgans, vel affligens, sed probans, & examinans. *Bell. Ibid.*

In primis apparet, igne uno modo in hoc contextu accipi debere. *Est. ad 1 Cor. 3. 13.*

Ignis conflagrationis.

Gravior tamen est ille ignis, quam quicquid potest homo pati in hac vita. *Aug. in Ps. 37.*

Libri, qui inscribuntur Hypognoſticon eruditi ſunt, & utiles, & vetuſti auctoris, ſed phraſin non habent Auguſtini, &c. *Bell. de Scriptur. Eccleſiaſt.*

Sive ibi tantum, ſive & hic & ibi, ſive ideo hic ut non ibi, ſecularia, quamvis à damnatione venialia, concremantem ignem tranſitorie tribulationis inveniant, non redarguo, quia forſitan verum eſt. *Aug. de Civit. Dei* l. 21, c. 26.

Solum dubitat, an ignis Purgatorius ſit idem in ſubſtantia cum igne Gehennæ, de quo dicitur *Mat. 25.* Ite in ignem æternum. *Bell. de Purgat.* l. 1, c. 10.

Tale aliquid etiam poſt hanc vitam fieri incredibile non eſt; & utrum ita ſit, quæri poteſt. Et ut inveniri, aut latere poſſit,

nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium (quando magis minùſue bona perentia dilexerunt) tanto lardiùs citiùſque ſalvari: non tamen tales, de quibus dictum eſt, quòd regnum Dei non poſſident, &c. *Aug. Enchirid. 69.*

But beſides what hath been cited before out of *Auſtine* (if *Hypognoſticon*, be his, which *Bellarmino* thinkes not, though hee ſaith, the work is learned and profitable, and done by ſome antient Authour) but beſides that, I ſay, *Auſtine* in his moſt elaborate peece, *de Civit. Dei*, handling this place of the Apoſtle, ſhewes himſelfe altogether un-reſolved whether there be any Purgatory fire after this life is ended. *Whether* (ſaith he) *they finde the fire of tranſitory tribulation burning up thoſe ſecular affections, which yet*

do not bring damnation, there only (in the other World) or both there and here, or therefore here that they may not find them there, I do not gaineſay, becauſe perhaps it is true.

Here we ſee *Auſtine* taking the point into conſideration, had no more then a *perhaps*, hee was farre from being aſſured of that which they call Purgatory. *Bellarmino* pointing at that place of *Auſtine*, but not citing the words, ſaith that *Auſtine* there doth onely doubt whether Purgatory fire be the ſame in ſubſtance with Hell-fire, of which it is ſaid, *Mat. 25.* Depart into ever-

laſting fire. But it was his policy to conceal *Auſtines* words; for all that have any view of them, muſt needs fee, that he doubts whether there be any Purgatory fire in the World to come. So the ſame Father in his *Enchiridion*, (which it ſeemes, he wrote when he was old) ſpeakes as doubtfully as may be of Purgatory. *That there is ſome ſuch thing alſo after this life, is not incredible; and whether it be ſo, may be inquired. But whether it be found, or lie hid, that ſome faithfull ones are ſo much the later or the ſooner ſaved by a certaine Purgatory fire, by how much they did more or leſſe love theſe good things that periſh; yet not any ſuch, as of whom it is ſaid, that they ſhall not poſſeſſe Gods Kingdome.*

Here hee makes it a question whether it be so, or no, and the most that hee saith is, That it is not incredible, which is farre from asserting it as a thing that ought to be believed. *Bellarmino* saith that *Austine* here only doubts, whether after this life soules be burnt with the fire of griefe for the losse of temporall things, as here they use to be when they are forced to want things, which they most desire. But besides that the words of *Austine* (which here also *Bellarmino* did prudently omit) doe plainly refuse this glosse, there is no sense at all (that I can see) in it. For how should soules after this life grieve for the losse of temporall things? Is there any use of temporall things after this life is ended? How then should *Austine* make it a question, whether soules in the other World are grieved, and even burnt with griefe for the losse of these things, which could doe them no good, if they had them? But againe, in the preceding Chapter of the same Book *Austine* treating of this place, 1 Cor. 3. 13, 14, 15. saith, that the fire, which the Apostle speaketh of, must so be understood, as that both passe through it, both he that upon the foundation buildes Gold, and Silver, and pretious stones, and hee that buildes wood, hay, and stubble; and this hee clearly proves by the words of the Apostle. Now this doth quite exclude Purgatory from being the fire there mentioned. For they will not have Purgatory to touch him that buildes Gold, and Silver, and pretious Stones, but onely him that buildes wood, and hay, and stubble. *Austine* therefore makes this fire that the Apostle writes of, to be tribulation, and saith, that a man is said to be saved, yet as it were by fire, because the losse of those things, which hee loved, doth burne him with griefe, yet nor subvert, nor consume him, because he is strongly fixed upon the foundation. And this may suffice for *Austines* testimony, which is objected against us. The next is *Ambrose*, who indeed saith that the Apostle in those words, yet so as by fire, doth shew that such a man shall be saved,

Bell. ubi supra.

Ignis enim, de quo locutus est eo loco Apost. Paulus, talis debet intelligi, ut ambo per eum transeant, id est & qui ædificat supra hoc fundamentum aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos, & qui ædificat ligna, fœnum, stipulam. — est quidem ignis tentatio tribulationis. — Salvus est quidem, sic tamen quasi per ignem. Quia urit eum rerum dolor, quas dilexerat, amissarum, sed non subvertit, neque consumit, fundamenti stabilitate atque incorruptione munitum. *Aug. Enchir. cap. 68.*

Cum dicit, sic tamen quasi per ignem,

ostendit saluum illum quidem futurum; sed pœnas ignis passurum, ut per ignem purgatus fiat saluus, & non sicut perfidi æterno igne in perpetuum torqueantur. *Ambros. in 1 Cor. 3.*

yet so as that he shall suffer the paines of fire, that being purged by fire he may be saved, and not as they that are perfidious, be for ever tormented with everlasting fire. Here hee interprets the Apostle indeed as speaking of a Purgatory fire; but yet it doth not appeare that he meant it of a Purgatory after this life. For notwithstanding any thing that I yet see to the contrary, hee may be understood of the fire of affliction, with which God doth purge his people here, that so they may not perish hereafter, 1 Cor. 11. 32. The same Authour (if yet the same; for many

Commentaria in Epistolas S. Pauli à multis non creduntur Ambrosii, nec sine causâ. Bellar. de Sc. ipsor. Ecclesiasticis.

Cave ligna, cave stipulam ad iudicium Dei tecum deferas, quæ ignis exurat. Cave cum in uno aut duobus habeas quod probetur, in pluribus operibus deferas quod offendar. Si cuius opus asserit, detrimentum patietur, potest tamen & ipse per ignem salvari. Unde colligitur quia idem homo & salvarur ex parte, & condemnatur ex parte. *Ambros. in Psal. 118. Serm. 20.*

thinke that those Commentaries upon *Paulus Epistles*, are not *Ambrosius*, and that not without cause, as *Bellarmino* judgeth) in the other place that is pointed at, as by the *Marquesse*, so also by *Bellarmino*, viz. *Serm. 20. in Psal. 118.* toucheth upon the words of the Apostle 1 Cor. 3. but how our adversaries can gaine any thing by him, I cannot see. Take heed (saith hee) thou doe not bring with thee wood, or stubble, which the fire may burne up, unto Gods judgement. Take heed lest being approved in one or two things, thou bring that, which in more workes doth offend. If any ones worke shall be burnt, he shall suffer losse, yet he also may be saved by fire. Whence it is gathered, that the same man is in part saved, and in part condemned. Here *Ambrose* himselfe sufficiently shewes, that hee speakes of the fire of Gods judgement, whereof hee makes expresse mention. Neither can he meane any such Purgatory as our adversaries plead for, seeing hee speakes of that which shall befall a man at the last judgement; for immediately before hee brings in that of the

Apottle 2 Cor. 5. 10. We must all appeare before the judgement seate of Christ, &c. and then addes that before cited. Take heed thou bring not with thee unto Gods judgement wood, stubble, &c. Now when the day of judgement commeth, then our adversaries hold that Purgatory ceaseth. *Bellarmino* notes this

Omnes oportet nos ante tribunal Christi assistere, &c. Cave ligna, &c. *Amb. Ibid.*

Primus error est Origenis, qui extendit tempora Purgatorii ultra diem Resurrectionis. *Bell. de Purgat. lib. 2. cap. 1.*

Apottle 2 Cor. 5. 10. We must all appeare before the judgement seate of Christ, &c. and then addes that before cited. Take heed thou bring not with thee unto Gods judgement wood, stubble, &c. Now when the day of judgement commeth, then our adversaries hold that Purgatory ceaseth. *Bellarmino* notes this

this as an error in *Origen*; that hee extends the time of Purgatory beyond the Resurrection. So much therefore for *Ambrase*. After him is cited *Hierome lib. 2. cap. 13. advers. Joan.* I suppose it is meant of *John* Bishop of Jerusalem, to whom *Ephiphanius* wrote an Epistle, admonishing him to beware of the error of *Origen*, which (it seemes) hee suspected him to be guilty of; this Epistle being written by *Ephiphanius* in Greeke, *Hierome* translated into Latine, and so it is inserted among the Epistles of *Hierome*, being the 60 Epistle. Then *Hierome* himselfe wrote a long Epistle, which is the 61. to *Pammachius* about the errors of this *John* of Jerusalem, which Epistle is divided into 16 Chapters. And after that another about the same subject to *Theophilus*, which contains but three Chapters. Therefore the Marquesse here must meane the Epistle to *Pammachius*, which yet *Chapt. 13.* hath nothing at all about Purgatory. *Bellarmino* cites nothing out of *Hierome*, against *John* of Jerusalem, but something out of him against the Pelagians, viz. this, *Li. 6. 10.*

If *Origen* say, that no reasonable creatures shall be destroyed, and give repentance to the Devill, what is that to us, who say that the Devill, and his Angels, and all the Wicked and ungodly do perishe for ever, and that Christians, if they be prevented in sin, shall be saved after punishment? Here indeed *Hierome* seemes to make some Christians after this life to suffer punishment, and yet to be saved. But if hee doe speake of punishment to be endured after this life (which is not cleare and certaine, though, I confesse, it is probable by those words, if they be prevented in sin) yet he seemes withall to have held that some even after the day of judgement shall be punished, yet so as to be saved, which *Bellarmino* (as I have shewed) noted as an error in *Origen*; and therefore *Hierome* in this (as it seemes) following *Origen*, doth dissent as well from Romanists as from Protestants.

Now that *Hierome* was of that opinion, may appeare by that which hee saith a little before in the same Chapter. *That which thou puttest in the Chapter following* (saith

Si *Origenes* omnes rationabiles creaturas dicat non esse perdendas, & Diabolo tribuit penitentiam; quid ad nos, qui & Diabolum, & satellites ejus, omnesque impios & pravificatores dicimus perire perpetuo; & Christianos, si in peccato preventi fuerint, salvandos esse post penas? *Hieron. advers. Pelag. Li. 6. 9.*

Illud verò, quod in sequenti ponis capitulo, in die judicii iniquis & peccatoribus non parcendum, sed æternis eos ignibus exurendos, ferre quis po-

test, & interdicere te misericordiam Dei, & ante diem iudicii de sententiâ iudicis iudicare; ut si voluerit iniquis & peccatoribus parcere, te præscribere non possit? dicis enim, scriptum est in Psal. 103. Deficiant peccatores à terrâ, & iniqui, ita ut non sint. Non dicit eos æternis ignibus exurendos, sed à terrâ deficere, & iniquos esse cessare. Aliud enim est, ipsos à peccato, & iniquitate desistere; & aliud ipsos perire imperpetuum, & æternis ignibus concremari. Hieron. *Ibid.*

he to his adversary) that the unjust and sinners shall not be spared in the day of judgement, but shall be burnt with everlasting fire; who can endure, that thou shouldst interdict Gods mercy, and before the day of judgement Judge of the Judges sentence? For thou sayest, that it is written in Psal. 103. Let the sinners faile from the Earth, and the unjust, that they be no more. — He doth not say, that they shall be burnt with everlasting fire, but that they faile from the Earth, and cease to be unjust. For it is one thing for them to cease from sin, and from iniquity; and another thing for them to perish for ever, and to be burnt with everlasting fire. Hierome seemes not to be so cleare in the other words for this, that some are punished after this life, and yet saved; as hee is in these words for this, that some shall be punished after the day of judgement, so as thereby to cease from sinne and iniquity (to be purged from it) but not so as to perish for ever and to be burnt with everlasting fire. Our adversaries therefore (so farre as I can see) must relinquish Hieromes testimony, who either saith nothing at all for them, or more then they would have. After Hierome is cited Gregory

lib. 4. dial. cap. 39. It is true, Gregory there saith, that for some light faulcs we are to believe that there is a Purgatory fire before the

(last) judgement. But marke 1. Gregory there immediately before cites many places of Scripture, as Job. 12. 35. Isai. 49. 8. with 2 Cor. 6. 2. Eccles. 9. 10. by which places

hee saith it is certaine, that such as every one is when he goeth out of this World, such shall he be when he comes to judgement. See then if these places of Scripture be not more

cleare against Purgatory, then that which hee after alledgeth, is for it. He alledgeth that Mat. 12. where it is said, that hee that sinneth against the holy Ghost, shall not forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the World to come. From whence he gathers, that some sinnes are forgiven in this World, and some in the World to come. But

Ex quibus nimirum sententiis constar, quia qualis hinc quisque egreditur, talis in iudicio præsentatur. Greg. *Ibid.*

In quâ sententiâ datur intelligi, quâdam culpas in hoc seculo, quâdam verò in futuro posse laxari. Gregor. *Ibid.*

But 1. how will this stand with that which he said before? For if some finnes not forgiven in this world, may be forgiven in the world to come, how shall every one be found at the last judgement such as hee is when he dieth? 2. The collection from that place of *Matthew*, is not good. For those words, *neither in this World, nor in the World to come*, import neither more nor lesse then *never*, as *S. Marke* expresseth it, *He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness. Mark. 3. 29.*

Theophylast expounds it thus, *he shall not be forgiven neither in this World, nor in the World to come*, that is, hee shall be punished both in this World, and in the World to come. And so also (as *Jansenius* confesseth) it is expounded by *Chrysostome*. Some observe

that *neither in this World, nor in the World to come*, is a Hebraisme for *never*. *Bellarmino* saith that this is false; but hee was not

so conversant in the Jewish writings, as to be fit to give sentence in this case. *Drusius*, who was better skill'd in that kinde, citeth

the Scholiast upon *Ben Sira* saying thus, *They that are of an intemperate tongue, cannot be cured, neither in this World, nor in the World to come.*

Besides *Jansenius* saith that this Conduplication, *neither in this World, nor &c.* doth signifie that as this sinne shall not be forgiven in this World, because of the enormity of it; so much lesse shall it be forgiven in the World to come, which is not a time of Grace, as this present

World is. If it be not a time of grace, how then can finnes be pardoned in that World, which here were not pardoned? We grant, that finnes may be said to be forgiven in the World to come, yet onely such finnes as are forgiven in this World, the forgiveness of which finnes shall be declared and made manifest in the day of judgement. *Bellarmino* himselfe saith that every one is examined, and receiveth his sentence when hee dieth, and then some begin to be punished, and some to be rewarded: and

aliqui præmiari; & tamen dicuntur hæc eadem fieri in novissimo iudicio, quia tuos fient eorum toto mundo manifestissime, &c. ita & eximen fieri potest in morte uniuscuiusque jusque privatum, & iterum postea in ultimo iudicio publicè. *Bel. de Purg. l. 1. c. 5.*

ix ἀποθνῄσκει, &c. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ταῦτα, καὶ ἐν τῇ κοίτῃ. *Theophy. in Mat. 11.*
Jansen. concord. cap. 49.

Drus. Prov. class. 2. l. 3. prov. 24.

Hæc conduplicatione significatur, quod sicut non remittetur hoc peccatum in præsentī seculo propter sui enormitatem: ita multo minus remittetur in futuro, quod non est seculum gratiæ, sicut præsens: *Jansen. Concord. c. 49.*

Sicut ergo sententia fertur in morte uniuscuiusque, & tunc incipiunt aliqui puniri

yet neverthelesse these things are said to be done in the last Judgement, because then they shall be done most manifestly before all the World, to the greater honour of the godly, and the greater shame of the wicked. Even so though sinnes are forgiven in this World, or not at all, yet they are said to be forgiven in the World to come; because in the last judgement it shall be made manifest to all the World that they are forgiven. 3. *Gregory* grants a Purgatory after this life onely for some small and light sinnes, as

Sed tamen, ut prædixi, hoc de parvis minimisque peccatis fieri posse credendum est, &c. Greg. ubi supra.

Peccata mortalia remittuntur in hoc seculo quoad culpam, & in alio interdum quoad pœnam. *Bell. de Purg. l. i.*

c. 4.

Quamvis hoc de igne tribulationis in hac nobis virâ adhibito possit intelligi, &c. *Greg. loc. citat.*

idle talking, immoderate laughing, &c. But they of the Church of *Rome* doe now hold, that mortall sinnes (as they call them) in respect of the punishment are sometimes remitted not here in this World, but in the World to come. 4. *Gregory* in that same place saith that the fire which the Apostle speaks of *1 Cor. 3. 13, 15.* may be understood of the fire of tribulation, which is endured in this life. What doe our adver-

saries now gaine by *Gregory*? Hee takes away one principall place, that they build upon for Purgatory: he alledgeth many places, from which by his own confession so much is evinced as indeed cannot consist with Purgatory: hee builds upon a place, which both in the judgement of other Fathers professedly commenting upon it, and also by diverse reasons appears to make nothing for Purgatory: and concerning that Purgatory, which he doth hold, he comes short of the opinion of our adversaries; all which things considered, they can get little by his testimony. The next and last Father objected against us is *Origen*, whose testimonie, if it were most cleare for a Purgatory after this life, yet it were of small force, he being censured (as I have shewed before) by *Bellarmino* as erroneous in this point, holding that there shall be a Purgatory even after the day of judgement. Yet *Bellarmino* also thought good to make use of his testimony,

Qui salvus sit, per ignem salvus sit, ut si quid fortè de specie plumbi habuerit admixtum, id ignis decoquat, & resolvat ut efficiantur omnes aurum purum. Orig. 6. hom. in Exod. 15.

viz. this, He that is saved, is saved by fire; that if perhaps he have any lead mixed with him, the fire may melt and consume it, that so all may be made pure Gold. Thus I confesse, *Origen* writes in the place, which the

Mar-

Marqueſſe citeth. And ſo alſo in the ſame place hee hath theſe words, which though *Belſarmine* doth not alledge, yet ſome have thought to make for Purgatory, and ſo they do as much as the other. *All muſt come to the fire, all muſt come to the Fornace.* Where in the margent it is noted (by *Genebrard*, I ſuppoſe, who was the overſeer of that Edition) that *Origen* ſpeakes of Purgatory. But it may eaſily appeare to any that looke into *Origen*, that neither in theſe words, nor in the other before cited, Purgatory is meant by that fire and fornace which he ſpeakes of, but affliction. *As the fornace* (ſaith hee) *doth try Gold, ſo doth affliction the righteous.* And ſpeaking of *Peter* he ſaith, *He was not ſo great, nor ſuch an one as that he had no mixture of lead in him. He had ſome, though but a little; and therefore the Lord ſaid unto him, why diſt thou doubt, O thou of little faith?* And then immediately follow the words which *Belſarmine* alledgeth, and the Marqueſſe (I preſume) aimeth at, *Therefore he that is ſaved, is ſaved by fire, &c.* What is this to the Romiſh Purgatory? I am confident, they will not ſay, that *Peter* had neede of this Purgatory, yet hee had of that which *Origen* ſpeakes of, and ſo all whoſoever they be, it being affliction, by which here in this life even the beſt are tried and alſo purified. And thus much for Purgatory; in the laſt place comes extreme unction.

Laſtly, (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *We hold extreme Unction to be a Sacrament: you neither hold it to be a Sacrament, neiſher do you preſſe it as a duty. We have Scripture for it; Jam. 5. 14. Is any ſick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him in the Name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith ſhall ſave the ſick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up; and if he have committed ſins, they ſhall be forgiven him. Neither any, nor all the Sacraments were, or could be more effectually to mens good, nor more ſubſtantiall in matter, nor more exquisite in forme, nor more punctuall in the designation of its Miniſtery; other*

Veniendum eſt ergo omnibus ad ignem, veniendum eſt ad conſolatorium.
Orig. Ibid.

Interpretatur locum Pauli 1 Cor. 3. de Purgatorio, quod conſolatorium vocat. *In marg.*

Sicut fornax probat aurum, ſic homines juſtos tentatio. Orig. Ibid.

Non enim tantus erat, ac talis (Petrus) qui nihil omnino de ſpecie plumbi in ſe haberet admixtum. Habuit licet parum; propter quod dicit ad eum Dominus, Modicę fidei, quare dubitaſti? Idcirco igitur qui ſalvus ſit, &c. Orig. Ibid.

Page 73.

Sacraments being bounded within the limits of the fountes onely good; this extends it selfe to the good both of soule and body. He shall recover from his sicknesse, and his sinnes shall be forgiven him. And yet it is both left out in your practice, and acknowledgement. The Fathers are on our side; Orig.bom.2.in Levit. Chrys. l.3. de Sacerd. Aug. in Speculo, & Ser. 215. de temp. Vener. Bed. in 6. Mar. & S. James; and many others.

Answe.

As for extreme Unction, as they call it, that is, the anointing of the sick with oyle, as the manner is in the Church of Rome, Protestants do not acknowledge it to be either a Sacrament, or a duty, because they see no ground in Scripture either for the one, or for the other. The Scripture indeed in two places, *viz.* that which the Marquesse citeth, and *Mar. 6. 13.* doth speak of anointing the sick with oyle: But that anointing was extraordinary, peculiar to those times, when there was, as other extraordinary gifts bestowed upon men, so, the gift of healing, which is mentioned, *Mat. 10: 1, 8.* and *1 Cor. 12. 9, 30.* in which places of Scripture this gift is ranked with casting out devills, speaking with strange tongues, and working of miracles. And so *Mark 6. 13.* It is said of the Apostles, *They cast out many devills, and anointed with oyle many that were sick, and healed them.* It is plain, that this anointing with oyle was of like nature with casting out of devills, that is, that it was a miraculous cure wrought by the Apostles. And that in Saint James was of the same kinde with this in Saint Mark, as I shall shew anon. But now the gift of healing in that manner being ceased, we say that the ceremony is to cease also, and not to be used. The Marquesse insisteth much upon the words of Saint James, as being very clear and full to prove both that this anointing is a duty, and also that it is a Sacrament. And so the Romanists must hold, because the Councell

Instiuta est sacra hæc unctio infirmorum, tanquam verè, & propriè Sacramentum N. F. à Christo D. N. apud Marc. quidem insinuat, per Jacob. autem Apost. ac Domini fratrem fidelibus commendatum, ac promulgatum, Concil. Trid. Sess. 14. de infirmis. cap. 1.

Ibid. de extr. Unct. can. 1.

of Trent hath determined, that *the holy anointing of the sick was instituted by Christ our Lord, as a Sacrament of the new Testament truly and properly so called; and that this Sacrament is insinuated in Mark, but commended to the faithfull, and promulgated by James the Apostle, and the Lords brother. And who soever shall gainsay this, the Councell doth pronounce*

pronounce them accursed. But there being two places of Scripture, which mention this anointing with oyle, it may seem strange that the Marquesse should alledge only the one, and wholly wave the other: wee shall see (I hope) by and by that this is as much as to quit both places, they being both to one and the same purpose. The Councell of *Trent* (we see) thought good to make use of both, yet so as to lay the more weight upon that in *James*, saying only that the Sacrament of anointing is insinuated in the other. And so *Bellarmino* doth mainly build upon the words of *James*, yet so as that he will have the words of *Saint Mark* to contain in them a figure and adumbration of this Sacrament, which they call *extreme Unction*. Let us take what they grant, viz. that the anointing mentioned *Mar. 6.* was not properly sacramentall. So much the Marquesse tacitely doth acknowledge, and *Bellarmino* expressly, citing for this opinion *Ruardus, Iansenius, Dominicus à Soto*, and others, yea confirming it by diverse arguments. 1. Because that anointing, which the Apostles used, was referred onely or chiefly to the cure of the body, as is manifest by the words of *Saint Mark*; but Sacraments directly concern the soul, and the body only by accident. 2. The Apostles as then were not Priests; and therefore could not administer Sacraments. Though they did baptize, yet (he saith) that is nothing, because it is not so of the essence of Baptisme, as it is of extreme Unction, that he should be a Priest that doth administer it. 3. The Apostles did promiscuously anoint all that were diseased, the blinde, and the lame, &c. but the Sacrament of Unction (they hold) is only for those that lie sick, and are like to die. 4. The Apostles did not enquire whether they whom they did anoint were baptized, or no, and it is altogether probable, that many were anointed by them, that were meer infidels. But neither extreme unction, nor any other Sacrament, (they say) belongs unto those that are not baptized. By these reasons *Bellarmino* proveth that the anoynting, which we read of *Mar. 6.* was not the Sacrament of extreme Unction. Now if this Sacrament be not meant in *Mar. 6.* neither is it in *Iam. 5.* For by the testimony both of ancient writers, and also of modern Romanists, the anointing which *Saint James* speaketh of, is the same with that which *Saint Mark*

Bell. de ex. r.

Unct. lib. 1. cap. 2.

Bell. Ibid.

Hoc & Apostolos fecisse in Evangelio legimus. Beda. ad illud Iac. 5. Un-
gentes cum, &c. ὅτι ἡλειφον ἐλαίῳ
οἱ ἀπόστολοι, μὴ ὁ Μάρκος δι-
ηγείται, ὃ καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφός
ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ φησιν,
ἀδελφεὶ τῆς, &c. Theophylact. ad Mar. 6.
Ita etiam Occumenius ad Iac. 5.

Quod sit eadem (Unctio) apparet ex
Theophylasto & Beda, qui testantur hanc
unctionem talem fuisse, qualis est ea,
cujus meminit Iacobus. Iac. 5. epist. sua.
Ex quibus patet, hos tenuisse unctionem,
cujus hic fit mentio, tandem fuisse
cum ea, cujus meminit Iacobus.
Iansen. ad loc. Mar. in Concord. cap. 55.

Alphonf. advers.
hæres. de cxiv.
unct.

Vellem hoc loco soli mihi essent hæ-
retici refellendi, liberius in solos in-
currerem. Nunc autem nonnullos ex
nostris auctoribus in hæreticorum cæ-
stris recognoscens timeo, ne dum in
hæreticos tela conjicio, aliquem for-
tè Catholicum feriam. Mitto illos pau-
lo verustiores, &c. Quid attinebat vi-
gente nunc Lutherianorum & Calvinia-
norum hæresi Catholicos doctosque vi-
ros dicere, scriptisque mandare, oleum
illud ab Apostolis non tanquam Sa-
cramentum ad sanandos animos, sed
tandem medicamentum ad curanda
corpora, adhibitu fuisse, neque hinc
de Sacramento, quo nunc Catholica utitur Ecclesia, extreme unctionis agi? — Ubi
ergo Sacramentum est, si hic non est? Maldon. ad Mar. 6.

mentioneth. Beda upon the words of Saint
James, anointing him with oyle, &c. doth paral-
lel that place with the other, Mar. 6. saying,
We read in the Gospel, that thou did the Apo-
stles. Thus also Theophylact upon the words
of Saint Mark saith, That the Apostles anoi-
nted with oyle, only Mark doth relate; which also
James the Lords brother doth say, Is any a-
mong you sick, let him, &c. Iansenius con-
fesseth that these Authours, Beda and Theo-
phylact, doe refuse that the anointing spoken
of Mar. 6. is such as Saint James doth men-
tion in his Epistle, and this he saith is evident
by their words, which he citeth. Bellarmine
doth attribute this opinion (viz. that the
same anointing is meant both Mar. 6. and

Jam. 5. to Waldensis, and Alphonfus de Castro, two late writers
(though one of them was a good while before Luther) both very
zealous in defence of the Church of Rome; yet I confesse, that in
Alphonfus where he speaks of extreme Unction, I doe not find

Mar. 6. mentioned. Maldonate upon Mar.
6. is most vehement for this, that the same
anointing is spoken of there, and Jam. 5. and
takes it very ill that any of their Authours
should hold otherwise, and should say, and
write, that the anointing which the Apostles
used, was not sacramentall for the healing
of the soule, but rather medicinall for the
curing of the body, and that the Sacra-
ment of extreme Unction, is not treated
of in Mar. 6. Where then (saith he) is this
Sacrament, if it be not here? Very good;

yet Bellarmine by unanswerable reasons hath proved that no such
Sacrament is here, viz. Mar. 6. and therefore by Maldonates
own inference it is no where, viz. in no place of Scripture
to be found. Maldonate objecteth, that the anointing

Mar. 6.

Mar. 6. could not be medicinall; because it was used for the healing of all diseases; and because the Apostles were not to use medicines, seeing it was not Physick, but the Gospel, which they professed. But this is of no force; for they whom *Maldonatus* opposeth, acknowledge that the oile, which the Apostles anointed with, did not naturally cure the diseased, nor was used as a naturall medicine; and they prove it by *Maldonatus* own argument, because naturally one medicine cannot cure all diseases. But they say, that by Christs institution upon this anointing with oile, the sick were healed. *Maldonatus* would take away this answer, saying, that there was no need of any sign, seeing that the cure which was wrought would work believe; and that the using of oile, would rather hinder faith; for that thereby people might think that the cure was wrought by the naturall vertue of the oile, and not by divine power. But the reason, which himselfe alledgeth, would hold off people from any such conceit, viz. because they might see that all manner of diseases were healed with one and the same oile, and that therefore it could not be by the naturall vertue of it. Besides, that immediately upon the anointing with oile, the sick were healed, whereas naturally some time would have been spent before the cure was wrought; Yet was not the anointing with oile superfluous, no more then the laying on of hands, which was used both for the healing of the sick, *Mar. 16. 18.* and also for the giving of the Holy Ghost, *Acts 8. 17.* though naturally that ceremony had as little vertue in that kinde as the other. Thus then whiles some of our adversaries say, that extreme Unction is not that which Saint *Mark* treateth of; and others of them say, that Saint *Mark*, and Saint *James* doe both speake of one and the same Unction, and that if extreme Unction be not spoken of *Mark 6.* we know not where to finde it in the Scripture; between them both we may safely conclude, that this Sacrament

Si medicamentum tantum erat, cur ad omne morborum genus adhibebatur?

—Deinde quorsum Apostoli medicamentis usi fuissent? Non enim medicinam sed Evangelium profitebantur, &c. *Ibid.*

Illud certum, quod oleum hoc non naturaliter sanabat aegros, nec adhibebatur ab Apostolis veluti naturale pharmacum. Nam quomodo eodem pharmaco quis mederi possit omnibus morbis? Sed ex Domini institutione Unctionem hanc sequebatur sanitas, &c. *Iansen. Concord. cap. 55.*

Quid ejusmodi opus erat signo, quum secuta statim sanitas fidem faceret? quam poterat quidem oleum non augere, sed abrogare, &c. *Maldon. loc. cit.*

of theirs hath no firme foundation. But because the Marquesse onely, and others mainly build upon the words of *S. James*, this

Nec ex verbis, nec ex effectu verba hæc loquuntur de Sacramentali Unctione extreme Unctionis; sed magis de unctione, quam Dominus Jesus instituit in Evangelio, à discipulis exercendam in ægrotis. Textus enim non dicit, infirmatur quis ad mortem, sed absolute, infirmatur quis? Et effectum dicit infirmi alleviationem: & de remissione peccatorum non nisi conditionaliter loquitur: quum extrema unctio non nisi prope articulum mortis detur, & directè (ut ejus forma sonat) tendit ad remissionem peccatorum. Præter hoc quòd Jacobus ad unum ægrum multos Presbyteros rum orantes, tum ungentes, mandat vocari, quod ab extreme Unctionis ritu alienum est *Cajet in Jac. 5.*

is to be added, that Cardinall *Cajetane* in his Commentary upon *James* doth not only parallel him with *Marke*, but also doth both say and prove that he doth not speake of the Sacrament of extreme unction. Because 1. The Text doth not say, *Is any sick unto death?* but absolutely, *Is any sick?* whereas extreme unction, as they use it in the Church of *Rome*, is onely for those of whose life there is no hope. 2. The effect of *S. James* his anointing is the raising up (the bodily amendment) of the sick; neither is any thing spoken but conditionally of the forgiveness of sinnes. Whereas extreme unction (as the forme of it doth shew) tends directly to the remission of sinnes.

3. *James* bids send for many Elders to one sick person, both to pray for him, and to anoint him, which is different from the manner of extreme unction. Thus wee see how many of our adversaries by consequence, and some of them directly grant, that there is nothing in the Scripture for that extreme Unction, which they use, and maintaine to be a Sacrament.

Cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum, & querere medicinam, &c. In quo impletur & illud, quod Apost. dicit, Si quis infirmatur, *Orig. Hom. 2. in Levit.*

Now for the humane testimonies, which the Marquesse alledgeth, the first is *Origens*, who in the place mentioned hath nothing to the purpose. He cites indeed the words of *S. James*, which speake of anointing with Oile, but it is not in respect of Unction, but in respect of Confession of sinne that hee doth cite them.

Bell. de Scrip. Eccles.

After him is cited *Austine in Speculo*; but there being 33. Chapters of that Booke, which of them is meant, wee cannot tell. Neither is it much worth the inquiry; for *Erasmus* shewes that Booke to be none of *Austines*, in that the Authour inserts some verses out of *Bortius*, who was long after *Austine*; Besides other reasons, which hee giveth; yet *Billarmine* asserting *Austine* to be

be the Authour of the Booke, takes no notice of the reasons alledged against it, though hee confesse that some doe doubt of it. In the other place of *Anstine*, which is pointed at, I finde indeed, that hee doth cite the words of *S. James*, but yet so as that our adversaries gaine litle by it. For hee referreth those words of anointing with Oile, &c. unto bodily health; and so inveigheth against those that by Charmes, and Spels, and the like superstitious and ungodly practices bring upon themselves manifold miseries. Now bodily health is a thing, which the Romanists have no respect unto in their Unction, but use it directly for the good of the Soule, even as they doe Baptisme, and the Lords Supper. And this also takes off the testimony of *Chrysostome*, who shewing what benefit people have by Ministers, or (as hee calles them) Priests, saith that Parents cannot prevent so much as the bodily destruction of their children; nor keepe off a Disease when it seizeth on them; but these doe often preserve people alive, when they are even ready to die; and sometimes mitigate their paine; and sometimes keepe them from being ill at all, not onely by the helpe of their Doctrine, and admonition, but also of their prayers. And then hee cites that *Jam. 5. Is any sick among you? Let him send for the Elders, &c.* All this is nothing to the Romish Unction; for besides that *Chrysostome* doth not at all speake of Priests anointing, but of their teaching, admonishing, and praying, and in this respect doth bring in the words of *S. James*; besides this, I say, it is directly a corporall benefit, which hee insisteth on, as freedome from sicknesse, mitigation of paine, deliverance from Death; and therefore that which hee saith, makes nothing for extreme Unction, which they of the Church of *Rome* say, was instituted of God to this end, that wee departing out of this mortall life,

Infirmatur aliquis, inducat presbyteros, &c. Videre, fratres, quia qui in infirmitate ad Ecclesiam cucurrerit, & corporis sanitatem recipere, & peccatorum indulgentiam merebitur obtinere. Cum ergo duplicia bona possint in Ecclesia inveniri, quare per praeantatores, per fontes, & arbores, & diabolica phylacteria, per characteres, & aruspices, & Divinos, vel fortilegos multiplicia sibi mala miseri homines conantur inferre? *Aug. Ser. 215. de temp.*

Parentes ne corporalem quidem interitum a liberis amoliri possunt, neque ingruentem morbum propulsare; cum hi (sacerdotes) laborantem, ac mortui jam jam propinquam animam identidem servarint, aliis remissiores penam insipientes, alios prorsus labi non permittentes, non Doctrinae solum, atque commonditionis, sed etiam precum subsidio. *Chrys. 4. 3. de sacer. d.*

Ut ex hac mortali vita decedentes, expeditiorem ad cælum viam haberemus, extremæ Unctionis Sacramentum (Deus) instituit. *Catechis. Trident. Sacramentum exequium. Ibid.*

life, may have a more ready way to Heaven. And therefore they call it *the Sacrament of such as goe out of this World*. What is this Sacrament then concerned in the words of *Chrysostome*, who speaks onely of preserving life and health here in this World? In the last place Venerable *Bede* is alledged. But 1. Hee is against them in this (as I have shewed before) that he makes *Marke* and *James* to speake

Plurimorum se adiutorio, & hoc seniorum curare meminerit, neque ad iuniores minusque doctos causam suam imbecillitatis referat, &c. *Bede in Jac. 5.*

Nec solum Presbyteris, sed ut Innocentius Papa scribit, etiam omnibus Christianis uti licet eodem oleo in suâ & suorum necessitate ungendo. *Bede. Ibid.*

Ut Minister sit sacerdos, est de essentia Unctionis. Non est rara Unctio, si laicus inungat. *Bell. de Extr. 1. 1. c. 2.*

Si quis dixerit proprium extremæ Unctionis ministrum non esse solum sacerdotem, anathema sit. *Concil. Trident. sess. 14. can. 4. de extrem. unct.*

Bellar. de Extr. 1. 1. c. 9. Jan. Concord. cap. 55.

Ecclesiæ consuetudo tenet, ut infirmi oleo consecrato ungantur à Presbyteris, & oratione comitante sapentur, Nec solum Presbyteris, &c. *Bede. loc. cit.*

both of one and the same thing; whereas diverse of them both say and prove, that *Marke* doth not speake of Sacramental Unction. 2. By *Elders Bede* understandeth Elders in respect of age. And hee saith expressly, and alledgeth also Pope *Innocentius* for it, that not onely Presbyters, but also all Christians may use this Oile and anoint with it, when either they, or any belonging unto them have neede. Which is enough to prove that he doth not make this Unction a Sacrament, as they of the Church of *Rome* doe. For (saith *Bellarmino*) it is of the essence of the Sacrament of extreme Unction, that the Minister of it be a Priest: and if a lay-man doe anoint any, it is of no force. Yea the Councell of Trent sayes, If any one shall say, that not only a Priest is the proper Minister of extreme Unction, let him be anathema. What doe they say to *Bede* then, and to *Innocentius* whom *Bede* citeth? They answer, that *Innocentius* and *Bede* speak not of him that is to administer the Unction, but of him that is to receive it. But this is a very violent and forced interpretation, and such as *Bede*'s words will not admit. For hee having said, It is the custome of the Church, that they that are weak should be anointed by Presbyters with consecrated Oile, and by Prayer accompanying it be made whole: immediately after he adds, Neither only Presbyters, but also (as Pope *Innocentius*

nocentius writeth) all Christians may use this Oile by anointing with it either in their own, or in their friends necessity. It is manifest, that Bede here speaketh of Christians using the Oile not so as to be anointed, but so as to anoint with it, and that both themselves and others, as they saw cause. 3. Bede also (as appears by his words even now cited) makes this anointing with Oile, which (he saith) the Church did use in his time, to have reference to the body, and the health of it; neither doth he speak any thing of any spirituall effect, that it should have upon the soule. And thus also it appears, that he doth not speake of the Sacrament of extreme Vnction. * *Cassander* also confesseth, that in the Church of *Rome* they have now departed from antiquity. 1. In this, that in more antient times they did not use (as now they do) to defer this anointing, untill life were even in extreme danger, and there was no hope of recovery. 2. In this, that antiently they used after this anointing, if there were danger, to receive the Sacrament of Christs Body and Blood; whereas now they have no such custome. Yea, the Catechisme of the Councell of Trent saith, that before extreme Vnction, the Sacrament of Penitence and of the Eucharist is to be administered; and that this is the perpetuall custome of the Catholike Church; which is directly contrary to that which *Cassander* affirmeth. But this (I hope) may be enough to shew that the Romish Sacrament of extreme Vnction hath no support either from the Scriptures, or from the antient Fathers.

post officium unctionis, si periculum imminebat, corporis & sanguinis Domini communicatio, quæ talis in & perfectio omnium Sacramentorum habebatur, subieceretur; à quo veteri more licet nonnihil hodiè varium sit, &c. *Cassand. consult. artis.* 22. Servanda est Ecclesie Catholice perpetua consuetudo, ut ante extremam unctionem, Penitentiae & Eucharistiae Sacramentum administraretur. *Catechis. Trident. de extrem. unct.*

* Olim hæc unctio non, ut hodiè ferè sit, ad extremum usque vitæ periculum, & valetudinem jam deploratam deferabatur, sed graviore aliquo morbo invadente hujusmodi orationes, & unctiones per septem aliquando dies continuabantur. Idè illud veteribus in more fuit, ut

The Marquess having waded thorough all the forementioned parts of controversie, and (as he supposeth) proved the Scriptures to be on their side, now sings as it were an *Epitaphion*, or a song of victory, saying, *Thou, most sacred Sir, we have no reason to wave the Scriptures Umpirage; so that you will bear it speak in the Mother language, &c.*

But how little the Scriptures Umpirage doth favour them of the Church of *Rome*, let the Reader judge by what hath been

Page. 154.

Ans.

been said on both sides, the Scripture being understood in that sense, which it selfe doth make out; and to which also the ancient Fathers and Doctors have subscribed, which (I suppose) the Marquesse doth mean by the Scriptures Mother-language. As for the Church of *Rome*, it hath long shewed it selfe the Scriptures step-mother, keeping it shut up in an unknown tongue, or not permitting Christians the liberty to make use of it, excepting such as can obtain a speciall dispensation for it; yea in many things going directly contrary to the Scripture, and even in a manner casting off the authority of it. Here presently after the Marquesse brings in the saying of *Austine*, *Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesia autoritas commoveret*, I should not beleieve the Gospel it selfe, unlesse I were moved by the authority of the Church; as if, were it not for the authority of the Church, the Scripture were of no force, neither could deserve any credit. So the Romanists do frequently pervert those words of *Austine*; but *Austine's* meaning was only this, that the Churches authority by way of introduction was a means to bring him to beleieve the Gospel, by propounding and commending the Gospel unto him, as a thing to be beleaved, whereas otherwise he should not have given heed to it, nor taken notice of it; not as if he did finally rest in the authority of the Church, and resolve his faith into it. No; for (as I have shewed before) he would have the Church it selfe sought in the Scripture, and proved by it. Had not the woman of *Samaria* told those, among whom she lived, of Christ, they had not come to the knowledge of him, much lesse to beleieve in him; yet having heard Christ himselfe, they did not rest in the testimony of the woman, but said unto her, *Now we beleieve not because of thy saying; for we have heard him our selves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, and the Saviour of the world.* Joh. 4.42. So should not the Church hold out unto us the Scriptures, we should not know, much lesse beleieve them; but at length (God by his Spirit opening our understandings that we may understand the Scriptures, *Luke 24.45.*) we come to be convinced by the Scriptures themselves, that they are the Oracles of God, and of divine authority. *Melchior Canus*, a learned Writer of the Church of *Rome*, holds that the formall reason of our faith is not the authority of the

Cui & certum subjiciendum est, rationem formalem nostræ fidei non

the Church of Rome, holds that the formall reason of our faith is not the authority of the

the Church, that is, that the last resolution of our faith is not into the Churches testimony. And he saith, that he could not dissemble their error, who hold that our faith is to be reduced thither, as to the utmost cause of believing. For the confuting of this error, he saith belongs that *Joh. 4. Now we believe not because of thy saying, for we our selves have heard him, and know, &c.* The same authour avertes, that the authority of the Church is not a reason by it selfe moving to believe, but only a cause (or meanes) without which we should not believe, viz. Because (as he addes) the Church doth propound unto us that the Scripture is the word of God, and except the Church did so propound it, we should never (ordinarily) come to believe it; yet we doe not therefore believe the Scripture to be Gods word, because the Church doth say it, but because God doth reveal it. *If the Church* (saith he) *doth make way for us to know such sacred books, we must not therefore rest there, but we must goe further, and must relye on Gods solid truth.* And then he brings in that very speech of *Austine*, and shewes what he meant by it. *Hereby is understood* (saith he) *what Austine meant, when he said, I should not believe the Gospell, except the authority of the Church did move me. And again, By the Catholikes I had believed the Gospell. For Austine had to doe with the Manichees, who without dispute would have a certain Gospell of theirs believed, and so would establish the faith of the Manichees. Austine therefore asks them what they would doe, if they did light upon a man, who did not believe so much as the Gospell; what kind of*

LHT

(223)

esse Ecclesie auctoritatem, h. e. fidei ultimam resolutionem non fieri in Ecclesie testimonium. — Eorum hic errorem dissimulare non possum, qui asserunt; fidem nostram eo, tanquam in ultimam credendi causam, reducendam esse. — Huc enim pertinet illud *Isaam. 4.* Jam non propter tuam loquelam credimus; Ipsi enim audivimus, & scimus, &c. *Mel. Can. locor. Theol. lib. 2. cap. 8.* Non est enim Ecclesie auctoritas ratio per se movens ad credendum, sed causa sine qua non crederemus. *Can. Ibid.* Proponit enim Ecclesia, ut rem exempli causa illustremus, Evangelium *Matthai* esse à Deo revelatum, &c. Ego igitur non credo Evangelistam dicere verum, quia Ecclesia eum dicit verum dicere, sed quia Deus revelavit. Et tamen Ecclesia proponens est causa sine qua ego non admitterem illud Evangelium esse *Matthai. Ibid.* Nec si nobis aditum præberet ad hujusmodi sacros libros cognoscendos, protinus ibi acquiescendum est; sed ultra oportet progredi, & solidà Dei veritate niti. Quà ex re intelligitur quid sibi voluerit *Aug.* cum ait, Evangelio non crederem, nisi me moveret Ecclesie auctoritas. Et rursum, per Catholicos Evangelio credideram. Videlicet negotium *Augustino* erat cum *Manicheis*, qui absque controversiâ suo cuidam Evangelio credi volebant, & *Manicheorum* fidem astruere. Rogat igitur *Aug.* ecquid facturi sint, si in hominem incidant, qui ne Evangelio quidem credat, quòve genere persuasionis sint eum in suam sententiam adducturi. Certe se affirmat non aliter potuisse adduci, ut Evangelium amplecteretur, quam Ecclesie auctoritate victum. Non itaque docet fundatam esse Evangelii fidem in Ecclesie auctoritate, verum simplici

perswasion

citer nullam esse certam viam, quâ five infideles, five in fide novicil, ad sacros libros ingreditantur, nisi Ecclesiæ Catholicæ unum eundemque consensum. Id quod ejusdem Epistolæ cap. 4. & in lib. de util. credendi ad Honorat. facis ipse explicavit. Gen. Ibid.

persuasion they would use to bring him to their opinion. He affirms; that himselfe could not be otherwise brought to embrace the Gospel, but that the authority of the Church did overcome him. He doth not therefore teach, that the faith of the Gospel is grounded upon the Churches authority, But only that there is no certain

Way, whereby either infidels, or novices in the faith, may have entrance to the holy books; but one and the same consent of the Catholic Church. This he himselfe hath sufficiently explicated in the fourth Chapter of that Epistle, and in his book to Honoratus concerning the benefit of believing. I have thus largely cited the words of this learned Romanist, because no Protestant can speak more clearly, and more fully to the purpose. That which the Marquesse after addeth, is nothing against us, viz. That there was a Church, before there was any Scripture; that though the Scripture be a light, yet we have need of some to guide us; though it be the food of our soules, yet there must be some to administer it unto us; though it be an antidote against the infection of the devill, yet it is not for every one to be a compounder of the ingredients; that though it be the onely sword and buckler to defend the Church from her Ghostly enemies, yet this doth not exclude the noble army of Martyrs, and the holy Church, which through all the world doth acknowledg Christ. All this, I say, is nothing at all against us, who do so assert the authority of the Scripture, as that we doe not evacuate the Churches ministry. Timothy must preach; but it is the word (viz. of God contained in the Scriptures) which he must preach. 2 Tim. 4. 2. If any man speak (for the instructing of others) he must speak as the Oracles of God. 1 Pet. 4. 11. He must confirm that, which he doth speak, by the Scriptures. And so on the other side they that hear, must take heed how, and what they hear. Luke 8. 18. Mark 4. 24. They must not believe every Spirit, but must try the Spirits, whether they be of God. 1 John 4. 1. They must to the Law, and to the Testimony; for that if any speak not according to this word, it is because they have no light in them. Isai 8. 20. They must search the Scriptures diligently, to see whether the things delivered unto them be so, or no. Acts 17. 11.



OF THE CHVRCH of ENGLAND.

THE SECOND PART OF THE

Rejoynder to the *Marquess of WORCESTER'S*
Reply to His late *MAJESTIE'S* Answer
to the said *Marquesse's* Plea for the
ROMISH RELIGION.



HE *Marquesse* saith, that he will now *Page 75.*
consider the *Opinions of Protestants*
apart from them of the Church of
Rome, and begin with the Church
of *England*. The Religion of this
Church, he saith, as it is in opposi-
tion to theirs, consists wholly in de-
nying, (for that what she affirms,
they affirm the same) as, the Real
presence, the Infallibility, Visibilty, Universality, and U-
nity of the Church, Confession and Remission of finnes,
Free-will, Possibility of keeping the Commandments, &c.
And you may as well (saith he) deny the blessed Trinity (for we
have no such word in Scripture, only inference) as that which you
have already denied, for which we have plain Scripture, &c.

But, 1. it is not altogether so, that what the Church of
England doth affirm, the same they of the Church of *Rome*
do affirm also. For the Church of *England*, Art 9. doth affirm
A a a (alledging

Ans.

(alladging the authority of the Apostle for proof thereof.)
that Concupiscence hath of it self the nature of sinne even

Si quis per Iesu Christi D. N. gratiam,
quæ in baptismo confertur, reatum
originalis peccati remitti negat; aut eti-
am asserit non tolli totum id, quod ve-
ram & propriam peccati rationem ha-
bet, sed illud dicit radi tantum, aut
non imputari; anathema sit, &c.
Council. Trident. de orig. peccat.

in the regenerate, which the Romanists
deny; the Councel of *Trent* accurseth
those that hold this doctrine. 2. In
what sense we deny the Real presence,
and the other particulars here menti-
ned, I have shewed before; as also what
little cause they have to boast, that ei-
ther Scripture or Fathers do make for

those assertions of theirs wherein we dissent from them.

Page 75.

That which the Marquesse after addeth of a Womans be-
ing head, supreme, or moderatrix in the Church, I have
likewise spoken to sufficiently before.

That a Lay-man should excommunicate, and that upon
every ordinary occasion, as non-payment of Fees, and the
like, for which the Marquesse taxeth this Church, I am con-
tent that it passe among the *Errata's* of our Church, as he
was pleased to speak (though without cause) concerning
some passages in the Fathers, as I have noted before. It is
our Doctrine, and not our Discipline, that I endeavour to
defend.

Page 76.

After the Church of *England*, the Marquesse commeth to
the Church of *Samoy*, and so passeth to the Church of *Geneva*,
as he pretendeth; but yet indeed he speaketh only of two
particular persons relating to those Churches, viz. *Luther*
and *Calvin*, as if whatsoever were held by them, were to be
imputed to those Churches to which they did relate: which
surely is not fair dealing; much lesse, that all Protestants
should stand charged with all their sayings, were they in-
deed such as the misconstruction of adversaries would make
them. We honour these, and many more, as men eminently
active in that great work of reforming the Church; yet do
we not ascribe an infallibility unto them, as the Romanists
do unto their Popes: We do not say of them, as *Bellarmin*e
doth of the Pope, that if they should command vices, and
forbid vertues, we were bound to believe vices to be good,
and vertues to be evil. No, we know the Apostle bids us

nell. de Pontif.
lib. 4. cap. 5.

prove

prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. 1 Theff. 5. 21.

But let us see what it is that the Marquesse doth say, and first of Luther. Of Luther's
Doctrine.

1. He chargeth Luther as saying of the book of Ecclesiastes, Pag. 76. That it hath never a perfect sentence in it, and that the Author thereof had neither boots nor spurs, but rid upon a long stick, or in begging shoes, as he did when he was a Friar. Obj.

The places which the Marquesse citeth for proof of this, I cannot examine, they not being in Luthers Works, of that Edition at least, which I have liberty to peruse. But therein I find that Luther doth comment upon the book of Ecclesiastes, and doth speak after a far other manner of it, saying, that it is a Book worthy that all should be much versed in it; and that all, and especially Magistrates, should be well acquainted with it. Answ.

Is liber multis nominibus dignus, cui omnium manibus teneretur, ac quibuscumque, tum vel maxime reipublice procuratoribus notissimus esset. Luth. tom. 4. prefat. in Eccles.

2. He taxeth Luther for saying of the book of Job, That the argument thereof is a meer fiction, invented only for the setting down of a true and lively example of patience. Obj.

If Luther did say thus (which is more also then I can find) though I am far from being of his mind; for I suppose, that if there had not indeed been such a man as Job in the history of him is described, the Prophet Ezekiel, and S. James would not have mentioned him as they do, Ezek. 14. 14, 20. Answ.

Jam. 5. 11. Yet that most famous Doctor amongst the Jewes, Moses Maimonides, shewes that some were of this opinion, that there never was such a man as Job, and that the history of him is but a parable. And this opinion himself inclines unto, though (I confesse) his reason is of small force, viz. because they that hold otherwise, cannot agree about the time in which Job lived.

Nosti quosdam esse, qui dicunt, Jobum nunquam fuisse, neque creatum esse; sed historiam illius nihil aliud esse quam parabolam: quæ incertitudo (temporis in quo vixit Job) sententiam illorum confirmat, qui dicunt illum nec fuisse, nec creatum esse. Maimon. More Neb. par. 3. cap. 22.

3. Luther (as is alleadged against him) saith, That it is a false opinion, and to be abolished, that there are four Gospels; and that the Gospel of S. John is only true. Obj.

Neither can I find any such thing as this in Luther, that Answ.

the Gospels written by the other three Evangelists, *Matthew*, *Marke*, and *Luke*, are not as true as that written by *John*. But I finde that which doth sufficiently evince the contrary, viz. that *Luther* in the fifth volume of his Works, hath Annotations upon the first seventeen Chapters of *St. Matthews* Gospel; and that in his Notes upon the first Chapter, he divers times calls both *Matthew* and *Luke* Evangelists, or publishers of the Gospel.

Obj.

4. *Luther* (as the Marquesse alledgeth) saith of the Epistle of *S. James*, That it is contentious, swelling, dry, strawy, and unworthy an Apostolical spirit.

Ans.

Camp. at. 1.

Dur. contra

W. bi. Breer.

Apol. Silu. con-

tra Epi. Molin.

Tibi vero Whitakere ignosco, qui exemplaria Wittembergæ tantum, vel Argentorati excusa legeris. Nam si quæ Jenæ olim edita fuerunt, vidisses, &c. *Dur. contra Whitak. fol. 8.*

And concerning the Epistle of *St. James*, *Luther*, not in the latter editions of Wittemberge corrupted by the *Zuinglians*, and others, &c. *Breerl. Apol. Tract. 2. ch. 2. sect. 10. subdivis. 2.*

Thus also divers other Romanists have charged *Luther*, as *Campian*, *Duraus*, *Breerley*, and *Silvester Petrasancta*; yet the words which they mention are not to be found in *Luthers* works. But (say the Romanists) they were in them, though afterward they were left out. I answer, Then, it seems if there were any such words, they were not approved: *Duraus* confesseth that those words are not in *Luthers* works set forth either at *Wittemberge*, or at *Strasburge*, but onely in those set forth at *Jena*; which argues that if there were any such words, they found but little approbation. *Mr. Breerley* saith, that the later Editions of *Luthers* works at *Wittemberge* were corrupted by the *Zuinglians* and others. But surely if *Luthers*

Works were corrupted, and that in the Editions of *Wittemberge*, it must be by others, and not by the *Zuinglians*. For is it likely, that the *Zuinglians*, who were such adversaries unto *Luther*, that *Mr. Breerley*, and after him the Marquesse doth frequently alledge them against *Luther*, is it likely (I say) that they should corrupt *Luthers* Works in that kinde, so as indeed to purge them from that which was amisse in them? And if they would do *Luther* this favour, yet how should they do it at *Wittemberge*, where (I suppose) not the *Zuinglians*, but the *Lutherans* did bear sway, and would have the chief hand in setting forth *Luthers* Works in that place?

And

And for that first Edition of *Luthers Works* at *Jenâ*, though

(it seems) *Luther* did speak lesse honorably of *St. James* his Epistle, as I confesse I find him to speak elsewhere in his Works, yet not so basely as his adversaries of *Rome* do charge him. *Gerhard*, a great *Lutheran*, saith that *Luther* indeed in his Preface to *S. James* his Epistle, in the first Edition of the *German Bible*, did say that this Epistle is not of like worth with the Epistles of *Paul* and *Peter*, and that it is strawie, if it be compared with those Epistles. But that he no where tearms it *contentious*, *swelling*, *dry*; nor yet simply, but onely comparatively *strawie*. And that after the year 1526. in no Edition of *Luthers Works* it is so called, but the contrary rather is to be found, to wit, that *Luther* did commend this Epistle (though some of the Ancients did reject it) and account it good and profitable. It

seems then, that *Luther* himself did retract that, which hee had written concerning the Epistle of *S. James*, his censure of it having been too bad; though yet not so bad as the Romanists would make it: And although this doth not justify *Luther* (as I do not desire to defend him, or any man in that wherein he is to be condemned) yet it might make his opposers the more mild, that *Eusebius* and *Hierome* of old do shew, that the authority of this Epistle was some while doubted of; and Cardinal *Cajetane*, *Luthers* contemporarie, did somewhat scruple at it; and so did he also argue against the authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Some also say, *Camp.* that *Erasmus* censures this Epistle of *James*, as not favouring of Apostolical authority. But in that Edition which I have of *Erasmus* his notes upon the New Testament, I finde no such censure,

Atque inde etiam facilè dicitur, Epistolam Jacobi nomine inscriptam, haudquaquam Apostolicam esse Epistolam. Nullum enim propè elementum in eâ de his rebus legis. *Luth. tom. 5. in 1. Pet. 1.*

Sanè in primâ Bibliorum Germanicorum Editione in Præfat. Epist. Jacobi scribit, eam non posse dignitate certare cum Epistolis Petri & Pauli, sed Epistolam stramineam esse, si cum illis comparetur. Sed 1. Nulpiam vocat contentiosam, tumidam, aridam. 2. Aliud est loqui ἀπλῶς, aliud συνησιμῶς. 3. In posterioribus Bibliorum Editionibus verba illa sunt omissa. Post annum 1526. in nullâ Bibliorum Editione straminea à Luthero vocatur. 4. Contrarium potius in posterioribus illis Editionibus habetur, videl. quòd eam quamvis à veteribus rejecta, tamen laudet, ac pro utili ac commodâ habebat. *Gerh. de S. Script. sect. 279.*

Euseb. hist. l. 2. c. 23. & l. 3. c. 22.

Hieron. in Cata. Script. Ecclesiasticæ. Cajet. in Jac. 1. 1. & in H. b. 1. 1. Vbi. contra.

Ventum supervacuum arbitror anxie de autore digladiari; rem potius amplectamur, & Spiritum S. autorem excolamur. *Erast. in Jac. 1. 1.*

* Whether it were the Apostle James, or some other,

but that he would not have us contend about the * Author, but to embrace the matter, acknowledging the Holy Ghost to be the Author of it. This advice is worthy to be followed by Protestants as well as Papists.

Obj.

5. Luther is taxed for saying, That Moses in his writings sheweth unpleasant, stopped and angry lips, in which the word of grace is not, but of wrath, death and sinne. And that hee calls him a Goler, executioner, and a cruel Serjeant.

Ans.

Breerl. ubi sup.

This doth Mr. Breerley object against Luther, and I grant that Luther indeed hath those words, tom. 3. in Psal. 45. But he speaks of Moses onely as contradiſtinct to Christ, as a meer Law-giver. For the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ, Joh. 1. 17. So Moses his ministration was the ministration of death, 2 Cor. 3. 7. and the ministration of condemnation, v. 9. The Law simply considered, doth convince of sinne, and condemn for sinne. For by the Law is the knowledge of sinne, Rom. 3. 20. And it saith, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to do them, Gal. 3. 10. Now no man doth, or can perform this, and therefore (saith the Apostle there) as many as are of the works of the Law, are under the curse. And so the Law worketh wrath, Rom. 4. 15. This is not through any fault of the Law, but by reason of sinne, which is a transgression of the Law, 1 Joh. 3. 4. and so makes liable to the curse and condemnation, which by the Law belongs to those that transgress. The Law (saith Ambrose) is not wrath, but it worketh wrath, that is, punishment to him that sinneth, in that it doth not pardon sin, but revenge it. And again, The glory of Moses his countenance (saith he) had not the fruit of glory, in that it did not profit any, but rather hurt, though not through its own fault, but through

Non ergo lex ira est, sed iram operatur peccati, id est, poenam, dum non ignoscit sed vindicat. Ambros. in Rom. 3. Quando enim nulli proficit gloria vultus ejus (sc. Moſis) non habuit fructum gloriæ, sed magis obſuit; licet non suo vicio, sed peccantium. Ambros. in 2 Cor. 3.

the fault of those that sinne. This is spoken of the Law, as it stands in opposition to the Gospel, wherein reconciliation and salvation through Christ is set forth. And in this sense only did Luther speak of Moses, as himself expressly sheweth. 6. The

Per totum Psalmum facienda est antithesis Moſi seu legis cum Evangelio. Luth. ubi supra.

6. The Marquesse addes, that for Luther's doctrine, he holds a threefold Divinity, or three kinds, as there are three Persons.

Obj.

For proof of this, only *Zuinglius* is cited. But *Luther* and he being such adversaries, their testimonies one against the other are of small force. Had any such thing been in *Luthers* writings, the Romanists themselves (I doubt not) would have found it out, and not have referred us only to *Zuinglius* for it. *Luther* on *Genes. 1.* doth expressly speak of three Persons, but one Divinity, as being the same in all the three Persons.

Ans.

Sancti Patres (præsertim *Augustinus* *l. 1. de civ. Dei, c. 24.*) observant, quod *Moses* his tribus verbis utitur, *Deus dixit, fecit, vidit*, quasi hoc modo tres Divinitatis Personas voluerit ostendere. *Luth. in Gen. 1.*

7. That *Luther* is angry with the word *Trinity*, calling it a humane invention, and a thing that soundeth very coldly.

Obj.

The place alledged I have not opportunity to examine: but thus much I say, that *Luther* believing the thing, viz. that there are three Divine Persons, (as I have shewed immediately before) I see not why he should dislike the word *Trinity*.

Ans.

8. That he justifies the *Arrians*, and saith, they did very well in expelling the word (*Homousion*) being a word that his soule hated.

Obj.

Thus also *Dureau*, and before him *Campion*, and before them both *Bellarmino* chargeth *Luther* with saying, that his soule did hate the word *Homousion*; which the Orthodox Fathers used, to shew against the *Arrians* the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. But they wrong *Luther*, as their manner is: For he doth not say, that his soul did hate that word; but that if his soul did hate it, and he would not use it, yet he should not be a heretick, so that he did hold the thing signified by the word, which the Fathers in the *Nicean* Council did determine by the Scriptures. He speaks thus in respect of the Papists, who will not be content with Scripture-terms, but will invent terms of their own to pervert the sense of Scriptures. As *Latomus* (against whom he writes) would not call Concupiscence sinne, as the

Ans.

Dur. defens. camp. Camp. rat. 8. Bell. præfat. diss. de christ.

Quod si odit anima mea vocem *Homousion*, & nolum eâ uti, non ero hereticus. Quis enim me cogit uti, modo rem teneam, quæ in concilio per Scripturas definita est. *Luth. cont. Latom.*

Paulus præcipit, ut vitæ profanas vocum novitates, & loquereris ut ipse loquitur, & sacris vocum antiquitatibus inhaereres. *Luth. contra Latom.*

Nec est quod mihi homouſion illud obiectes, adverſus Arrianos receptum. Non fuit receptum à multis, iisque præclarissimis, quod & Hieronymus optavit aboleri, &c. — Erſi Arriani malè ſenſerunt in fide, hoc tamen optimè, ſive malo, ſive bono animo exegerunt, ne vocem profanam, & novam in regulis fidei uſurpare liceret. Scripturæ enim ſinceritas cuſtodienda eſt, nec præſumat homo ore ſuo loqui aut clariùs, aut ſincerius, quam Deus elocutus eſt ore ſuo. *Luth. ibid.*

the Apoſtle calls it, but a puniſhment of ſinne. Hereupon *Luther* (I think) went too far concerning the word *Homouſion*, though not ſo far as his Romiſh adverſaries do charge him. He ſaith that this word uſed in confutation of the *Arrians* is not to be objected againſt him: For that many, and thoſe moſt excellent men did not receive it, and that *Hierome* wiſhed it were aboliſhed. And that although the *Arrians* did erre in the faith, yet they did well however to require, that a profane and new word might not be uſed in rules of faith: For that the ſincerity of Scripture is to be preſerved, and man is not to preſume to

ſpeak either more clearly, or more ſincerely then God hath ſpoken. I confeſſe that *Luther* in this ſeemeth to me to exceed, as men are apt to do in favour of that cauſe which they proſecute. But yet it appears that he was found in the faith, and did not comply with the *Arrians*, who oppoſed the word *Homouſion*, not ſo much for the new invention, as for the ſignification of it.

Excerl. Apol. tract. 2. ch. 2. ſect. 10. ſubdiviſ. 13.

Mr. Breerly, who hath alſo this charge againſt *Luther*, (as indeed he hath moſt of that which the Marqueſſe objecteth againſt Proteſtant Divines) cites *Luther* againſt *Latomus*, in the Edition of *Wittenbergh* 1551. and ſaith, that the latter Editions are altered and corrupted by *Luthers* Scholars, as he had ſhewed (he ſaith) the like before, viz. concerning that place, where *Luther* (they ſay) did ſpeak ſo reprochfully of *S. James* his Epistle. But, 1. This is not like the other: For here he ſaith, *Luthers* works were altered by his Scholars; but there he ſaith, they were altered by his adverſaries. 2. As I have ſhewed the other to be improbable, ſo alſo is this. For *Luther* died anno 1546. ſo that the Edition which was anno 1551. was five years after *Luthers* death; and ſurely by that time *Luthers* Scholars had leiſure enough to make ſuch an alteration, as Mr. Breerly ſpeaks of, in *Luthers* works,

Sleidan. comment. lib. 16.

if they had been so minded. I cannot therefore but take this as a trick of Mr. Breakey's, when he saw *Campian's* quotation of *Luther* confuted by Dr. *Whitaker*, to pretend some former Edition of *Luthers* Works, as having it so as *Campian* allcaded. And this is the more apparent, in that *Dureau* professedly taking upon him the defence of *Campian* against Dr. *Whitaker*, never so much as takes notice of that which the Doctor saith against *Campian* for falsifying the words of *Luther*, so far was he from knowing of that pretended Edition anno 1551. which should have it (forsooth) just so as *Campian* quoted it.

9. *Luther* (as the Marquesse telleth us) affirmed, that *Christ* was from all eternity, even according to his humane nature. For proof hereof onely *Zuinglius* is cited.

But (as I noted before) *Zuinglius* his testimony is not sufficient to make good a charge against *Luther*. Let *Luthers* words be produced, and then it will appeare that he is justly charged.

10. He affirms (saith the Marquesse) that as *Christ* died with great pain, so he seems to have sustained paines in hell after death.

Indeed I finde such words in *Luther* on *Plal.* 16. and I acknowledge it to be a grosse errour, so far am I from defending him in it. But withall this I finde, that *Luther* was nothing confident in that particular. For he addes immediately, that he would so understand the words of *Peter Act.* 2. 24. until he were better informed

11. That the Divinity of *Christ* suffered, or else he were none of his *Christ*.

This also *Bellarmino* doth object against *Luther*; and I confess, that if the word *Divinity* be strictly and properly taken, the assertion is most erroneous. But *Bellarmino* probably was not ignorant that *Aquinas* observeth, that because of the identity that is betwixt the divine Nature, and the divine Person, sometimes the Nature is put for the Person. And

Obj.

Answ.

Obj.

Answ.

Christus sicut cum summo dolore mortuus est, ita videtur & dolores post mortem in inferno sustinuisse, ut nobis omnia superaret. *Luth.* *tom.* 3. in *Ps.* 16. Ita ego interea verbis *Petri Act.* 2. inhererebo, donec meliora doctus fuero. *Luth.* *ibid.*

Obj.

Answ.

Bell. de Christo in Prefat.

Propter identitatem, quæ in divinis est inter naturam & hypostasim, quandoque natura ponitur pro personâ, vel hypostasim. Et secundum hæc dicit *Aug.* naturam divinam esse conceptam & natam, quia scilicet persona Filii est concepta & nata secundum naturam humanam. *Aquir. par.* 3. *quest.* 35. *art.* 1. ad 1.

that thus *Austine* saith, that the divine Nature was conceived and born, because the Person of the Son was conceived and born, in respect of the humane nature. So in like manner *Luther* might say, that the Divinity, or divine Nature did suffer, because the Person of the Son did suffer according to the humane nature. That *Luther* meant

no otherwise then thus, is clearly his words, which I finde in *Gerhard*, viz. these, *If I (shall suffer my self to be persuaded that onely the humane nature did suffer for me, truly Christ shall be a Saviour of small worth unto me, for he himself at length will need a Saviour. — If perhaps that bewitching lady Reason will reclaim, saying, The Divinity cannot suffer, nor dye; thou shalt answer, That indeed is true; yet neverthelesse because the Divinity, and the Humanity in Christ make one person, therefore the Scripture because of the hypostatical union doth attribute to the Divinity all those things which happen to the Humanity; and so to the Humanity those things which belong to the Divinity. And truly thus it is indeed; for we must needs confesse, This Person (Christ being pointed at) doth suffer and dye. But this Person is true God. Therefore it is rightly said, The Son of God doth suffer. For though one part of him (as I may so speak) viz. the Deity doth not suffer; yet that person, which is God, doth suffer in his other part,*

no otherwise then thus, is clearly his words, which I finde in *Gerhard*, viz. these, *If I (shall suffer my self to be persuaded that onely the humane nature did suffer for me, truly Christ shall be a Saviour of small worth unto me, for he himself at length will need a Saviour. — If perhaps that bewitching lady Reason will reclaim, saying, The Divinity cannot suffer, nor dye; thou shalt answer, That indeed is true; yet neverthelesse because the Divinity, and the Humanity in Christ make one person, therefore the Scripture because of the hypostatical union doth attribute to the Divinity all those things which happen to the Humanity; and so to the Humanity those things which belong to the Divinity. And truly thus it is indeed; for we must needs confesse, This Person (Christ being pointed at) doth suffer and dye. But this Person is true God. Therefore it is rightly said, The Son of God doth suffer. For though one part of him (as I may so speak) viz. the Deity doth not suffer; yet that person, which is God, doth suffer in his other part,*

viz. the Humanity.

Si in una lance appenduntur peccata nostra & ira Dei peccatis nostris debita, ac in altera lance ponatur tantum humane nature mors aut homo tantum pro nobis passus, tunc altera lanx ad infernum usque nos deprimet. Quod si vero in adversa lance ponatur Dei passio Dei mors, Dei sanguis, seu Deus pro nobis passus, & mortuus, tunc gravior & ponderosior fiet lanx ista quam omnia peccata nostra, & universa Dei ira, *Luth. ibid.*

For indeed the Son of God was crucified for us. That same, I say, that same Person was crucified according to the Humanity. And again, If our sinnes, and Gods wrath due to our sinnes be weighed in one scale, and in the other scale be put onely the death of humane nature, or onely a man having suffered for us, then the other scale will weigh us down to hel.

But

But if in the opposite scale be put the passion of God, the death of God, the blood of God, or God having suffered for us, then that scale will be more heavy and ponderous then all our sinnes, and all Gods anger. This doth abundantly shew that Luther was most orthodox in this point touching Christs Person and Natures. And thus that also is answered, which immediately followeth, being indeed but the same with that which went before; viz. That if the humane nature should onely suffer for him, Christ were but a Saviour of vile account, and had need himself of another Saviour. In what sense Luther spake this, and how sound and true it is in that sense wherein he spake it, is evident by his own words before cited.

12. The Marquesse cites Hospinian, saying, that Luther held the body and blood of Christ both is and may be found according to the substance not only in the bread and wine of the Eucharist, or in the hearts of the faithfull, but also in all creatures, in fire, water, or in the rape and halter, wherewith desperate persons hang themselves.

Obj.

Whether Hospinian writ thus of Luther, not having his book which is cited, I cannot say. Hospinian being, though a Protestant, yet against Luther in point of the Sacrament, might peradventure wrest Luthers words beyond his meaning. However if Luther did hold so, I leave him to answer for himself, or some other to answer for him. I hold both him to have erred in his Consubstantiation, and the Romanists in their Transubstantiation.

Answ.

13. Luther (as is objected) averreth that the ten Commandments belong not unto us, for God did not tell us, but the Jews forth of Egypt.

Obj.

That Luther speaketh to this effect, I grant; yet was he far from reaching that Christians are free from the observation of the ten Commandments. For immediately after that which the Marquesse citeth, he saith thus, Falsely therefore do fanaticall persons burthen us with the Law of Moses, who spake nothing unto us. Indeed we receive and acknowledge Moses

Answ.

Falso ergo fanatici lege Mosi nos onerant, qui ad nos nihil locutus est. Doctrinam sane Moysi recipimus, & agnoscimus; unde multum salutaris, ut paulo post dicitur, doctrinam discimus. Sed legislatorem aut gubernatorem

non agnoscimus, cum ipse suam ministerium tantum ad illum populum restrinxerit. — Non habere Deos alienos, Deum timere, ei considerare, & obedire, non abuti ejus nomine, parentibus honorem habere, &c. sunt ab omnibus servanda, & ad omnes pertinent, sed non quia à Mose præcepta, sed quia naturæ hominum hæc leges (quæ in decalogo recitantur) inscriptæ sunt. Quare etiam gentes, quibus Moses ignotus fuit, & quibus Deus non est locutus, ut illis, norunt Deo esse obediendum, Deum esse adorandum, honorandos parentes, &c. *Luth. rom. 3. Quo modo libri Moysi legendi sunt.*

did to the Israelites, knew that God is to be obeyed and worshipped, that parents are to be honoured, &c.

This doctrine of Luther is no other then they of the Roman

Quamvis expeditior sensus videatur de lege quatenus ceremonialis est: nihil tamen vocat universam legem à Mose datam intelligi, quatenus ab eo lata est. Tota enim Moysi legislatura cessat per Christum, nec lege decalogi Christianus tenetur, nisi quatenus cum lege naturæ convenit, & à Christo renovata est. § II. ad Gal. 2. 19.

the whole legislative office of Moses doth cease by Christ; neither is a Christian bound by the Law of the Decalogue, but as it doth agree with the Law of nature; and is renewed by

Quamvis hæc lex Judæis in monte à Domino data fuerit, tamen quoniam naturæ omnium mentibus multo ante impressa, & consignata erat, atque ob eam rem Deus universos homines illi perpetuo parere voluit; plurimum prodidit yeshualla, quibus Mose ministro atque interprete, Hebræis promulgata est, & populi Israelitici historiam quæ mysticiorum est plena diligenter explicare. Catech. I. videtur, in unum explicatam decalogi.

as a teacher, from whom we learn much wholesome doctrine, as shall be shewed a little after. But we do not acknowledge him our Lawgiver, or Governour, seeing he restrained his Ministry to that people, viz. the Jews. — Not to have other gods, to fear God, to trust in him, and to obey him, not to abuse his name, to honor parents, &c. these things are to be observed by all, and belong to all: yet not because they were commanded by Moses, but because these Laws (which are rehearsed in the Decalogue) are imprinted in mans nature. Wherefore also the heathens, that knew not Moses, and to whom God did not speak, as he

did to the Israelites, knew that God is to be obeyed and worshipped, that parents are to be honoured, &c.
Church do teach. Estius, a great Doctor of that Church, writing upon those words, Gal. 2. 19. I through the Law am dead to the Law, saith, Although the sense may seem more easie, if it be understood of the Law, as it is ceremonial; yet may the whole Law given by Moses be understood, so far forth as it was given by Moses. For the whole legislative office of Moses doth cease by Christ. So the Catechist set forth by the decree of the Council of Trent, comming to explain the ten Commandments, saith, Although the Law was given by the Lord in the Mount to the Jews, yet because by nature it was long before imprinted in the mindes of all, and so God would have all at all times to obey him; it will be very profitable diligently to explain these words in which by the Ministry of Moses the

the Law was promulgated to the Hebrews, &c. Here they clearly intimate, that the ten Commandments do not concern Christians as published by *Moses*, but as imprinted in the heart of man by nature; which is all that *Luther* teacheth, who both in his greater and lesser Catechisme expoundeth the ten Commandments, which he would not have done, if he had held that they do not bind Christians to the observing of them. But this doctrine he expressly disclaimeth, as I have already shewed.

14. *Luther* is taxed for saying, that faith, except it be without (even the least) good works, doth not justify, and is not faith.

Obj.

Nothing is alledged out of *Luthers* writings for proof of this, but onely *Cowels* defence of *Mr. Hooker* is cited, which book I have not to peruse; yet I finde

Ans.

Bellarmin citing *Luthers* own words to this very purpose. But *Luthers* meaning (I suppose) was onely this, that in the work of justification faith is altogether without works, so that no works concur with it unto justification: not but that otherwise faith is accompanied with good works, so that where faith (true justifying faith) is, there will be good works also. *Bellarmin* indeed doth tell of some rigid Lutherans, who so hold faith alone to justify, as not to admit other virtues so much as to be present with it. And this he saith they would have to be *Luthers* opinion; yet he confesseth *Chemnitius*, a famous Lutheran, to agree with *Calvin* in this, that though faith alone doth justify, yet faith that doth justify is not alone, even as the heat of the Sun alone doth burn, yet that heat is not alone, but hath light joyned with it.

Tom. 1. operum suorum sic ait in 3. Propositione, Fides nisi sit sine ullis, etiam minimis operibus, non justificat imo non est fides. *Bellar.* de Justif. l. 1. c. 12.

Bellarmin

And for *Luther* himself, his writings plainly shew, that although he exclude works from having any thing to do in our justification, as generally Protestants do, yet he was no enemy to good works. After that we have taught faith in Christ (saith he) we also teach good works. And again, We do not reject works, and love, as the adversaries

Postquam fidem in Christum docuimus, docemus etiam de bonis operibus. Non quod opera aut charitatem rejiciamus, ut adversarii nos accu-

do

fant. *Luth. in Gal. 2.* Fides non ficta, neque hypocritica, sed vera, & vivax ea est, quæ exercet, & urget bona opera per charitatem. — Verè non credit si opera charitatis fidem non sequuntur. — Dicunt, si fides, sine opere justificat, ergò nihil operemur, sed credamus solum, & faciamus quæ volumus. Non sic impii, dicit Paulus: verum est, sine operibus fidem justificare; sed de fide verà loquor, quæ postquam justificaverit, non steterit otiosa, sed est per charitatem operosa. *Luth. in Gal. 5. 6.*

Obj.

15. *Luther is charged with saying, That we are equal in dignity and honour with St. Paul, St. Peter, the blessed Virgin Mary, or all the Saints.*

Ans.

The Edition of *Luthers Works* which the Marquess citeth, not agreeing in the folio's with that which I meet with, I cannot tell whether *Luther* saith thus or no; or if he do, in what sense he saith it; but if he have such words, I presume he meaneth in respect of imputed righteousness, which is one and the same to all that beleeve, not in respect of inherent righteousness, which is more in some then in others.

Sine maculâ depuratur, quia culpa non imputatur. Gilbert. in Cant.
4-7.

In respect of imputed righteousness, the Sponse of Christ here upon earth is all fair, and there is no spot in her. But in respect of inherent righteousness just men are not made perfect until hereafter in the life to come. *Heb. 12. 23.* In this respect the inward man is renewed day by day, *2 Cor. 4. 16.*

Obj.

16. *That all the holiness, which they have used in fasting, and prayer, enduring labours, chastising their bodies, austerity and hardnesse of life, may be daily performed by a hog or a dog.*

Ans.

Whether this charge be true, I cannot examine for the reason even now alladged. Neither do I see how *Luther* or any rational man should make prayer a thing performable by a hog or a dog. Otherwise who seeth not, but that these brut creatures may be made to fast (*see Jon. 3. 7. 8.*) and to endure bodily hardnesse? The Apostle clearly distinguisheth betwixt bodily exercise and godlinesse, *1 Tim. 4. 8.* And both

Scripture

Scripture and experience shew, that all these things mentioned by the Marquesse, may be performed by the wicked as well (I mean for the outward act) as by the godly. See *Isa.* 1. 11. to 15. and *Isa.* 58. 3. &c.

17. Another charge against Luther is: that he holdeth, That in the absence of a Priest, a woman, or a boy, or any Christian may absolve.

Obj.

It seems then that Luther doth not say, that any may do it as well as a Priest, for then what need to say, in absence of a Priest? And may not any Christian declare the glad tydings of salvation unto an afflicted conscience? Doth not the Apostle, speaking to Christians in general, bid them comfort the feeble-minded, 1 Thess. 5. 14. As for that confession to, and absolution by a Priest, which the Romanists contend for, we know no ground nor warrant in Scripture for it.

Answ.

18. The next charge is, that he saith, They only communicate worthily, who have confessed and erronious consciences.

Obj.

I finde this objected by Campian, and answered by Dr. Whitaker, so as to acknowledge the truth of the assertion in this sense, that they only are meet for the Sacrament, who are sensible of their sins, and so of the need they have of Christ for the remission of them, according to that of our Saviour, The whole have no need of the Physician, but they that are sick, Mat. 9. 12.

Answ.

Camp. rat. 8.
Whitak. Resp.
ad rat. Camp.

19. That a Priest, especially in the New Testament, is not made, but born, not consecrated, but created.

Obj.

Where Luther saith thus, I cannot finde, nor can I conjecture what he meaneth, if he do say it.

Answ.

20. That the Sacrament were true, though it were administred by the Devil.

Obj.

How Luther is baited for this by Hospinian and Covell, his fellow-Protestants (as the Marquesse saith he is) I wanting their books cannot see: but if Luther meant of such a Devil, as Christ spake of, viz. a Judas, Joh. 6. 70. neither Protestants nor Papists can justly oppose him, they holding (as generally they do) that the vertue of the Sacrament doth not depend upon the dignity of him by whom it is administred.

Answ.

Obj.

21. That among Christians, no man can or ought to be a Magistrate; but each one is to other equally subject: and that among Christian men none is superior save one, and only Christ.

Answ.

Breerl. Apol.
tract. 3. sect. 5.

This same charge is also brought against Luther by Mr. Breerley, who yet hath that which is a sufficient answer to it: For he cites Luther admonishing to obey the Civil Magistrate, on'y not allowing him power over the conscience. This indeed is Christs prerogative; and in this respect Christians are to be subject only unto Christ. *Ye are bought with a price, be ye not the servants of men,* 1 Cor. 7. 23. We must indeed be subject to the higher power for conscience sake, Rom. 13. 5. but that is, because God, who is Lord over the conscience, doth command it: so that it is not the Magistrates power, but Gods only that doth reach the conscience.

Obj.

22. That the Husband, in case the Wife refuse his bed, may say unto her, *If thou wilt not, another will; if the Mistress will not, let the Maid come.*

Answ.

This being objected by Campian, Dr. Whitaker answers, that Luther counselled the Husband to speak thus to the Wife, *in terrorem*, so as thereby to affright her out of her obstinacie. Yet he acknowledgeth, that Luther in point of Divorce went too far, and that he was not willing to plead for him. Neither will I, in any thing wherein he is justly taxed: As I confesse he is in the two next particulars that follow, (which also concern the same subject) if he did indeed assert those things which are alledged.

Obj.

23. That Polygamie is no more abrogated then the rest of Moses law; and that it is free, as being neither commanded nor forbidden.

Answ.

Two places in Luthers Works are here quoted to make good this charge, one whereof I cannot find, but the other I meet with, (though not of that Edition indeed which is expressed) and find that which is quite contrary to this here objected. Luther commenting

Abraham quoque insignis sanctimonia est, qui cum se usumq; exemplo tueri, & aliam ducere poterat, (polygamia enim tum in usu erat) tamen id non fecit, nisi uxore juberet. Luth. in Gen. 16.

on Gen. 16. where Abraham by the advice of Sarah being barren, took Hagar for his Concubine, saith that Polygamie was then in use, and so Abraham might of himself following the custome of

of the times have taken another wife, but yet would not do it till *Sarah* did put yim upon it. And from this fact of *Abraham*, he saith, we must not frame an example, as if we might do the like. And that though the Old Testament did permit Polygamie, yet now in the New Testament it is otherwise. So that *Luther* (so far as I find) was far from making polygamie a thing indifferent, and free for any that have a minde to it.

24. That it is no more in his power to be without a woman, then it is in his power to be no man: and that it is more necessary then to eat, drink, purge, or blow his nose.

Luther here speaks of himself; and what his power was in this particular that he speaks of, he had best cause to know. Indeed *Mr. Breerly* together with these words cites some other sayings of *Luther*, wherein he seems to speak generally of all, as being altogether unable to contain from women. And to this effect also the *Marquesse* here immediately after cites some words of *Luther* in Latine, saying that not any of his English shall be accessory to the transportation of such a blast into his native language. But it is usual with them of the Church of *Rome* to pervert, if not the words, yet the meaning of their adversaries, and especially of *Luther* and *Calvin*, against whom they bear the greatest hatred. Candor and ingenuity would easily conceive, that *Luther* spake in that manner, of men, as for most part they are, viz. not having the gift of continencie, which comparatively but few have.

Luther's own words (as *Mr. Breerly* himself doth cite them) sufficiently declare his meaning. The young woman (saith he) that hath not this high gift of continencie, can no more want a husband, or a man, then she can want meat, drink, sleep, &c.

25. *Luther* (saith the *Marquesse*) saith, How can a man prepare himself to good; seeing it is not in his power to make his wayes evil? For God worketh the wicked work in the wicked.

Porro ex hoc facto non est constituendum exemplum, quasi nobis eadē liceat facere; circumstantiæ enim considerandæ sunt, &c. Igitur singulare hoc horum conjugum factum neutiquam in exemplum habendum, præsertim in Novo Testamento; nam Vetus Testamentum polygamiam etiam liberorum causâ permittit. *Luth. ibid.*

Obj.

Ans.

Breerl. Apol. tract. 2. cap. 3. sect. 10. subd. vij. 11.

Puella, in quâ non est sublime hoc donum continentiæ, nihilo facilis carere potest marito, aut viro, quàm cibo, aut potu, somno, &c. *Luth. apud Breerl. loc. citat.*

Obj.

Ans.

One of Luther's Books, wherein he is said to speak thus, I finde among his Works, (*viz. de servo arbit.*) But the Edition being diverse from this here mentioned, I cannot finde the words that are objected. If Luther have these words, I doubt not but by the circumstances of the place it will appear, that he was free from charging God foolishly; however that expression seem harsh, That God worketh in the wicked work in the wicked. Yet in some sense this may be affirmed.

Actus peccati & est ens, & est a deo, & ex utroque habet quoddam sit a Deo. Omne enim ens, quocunque modo sit, oportet quod derivetur a primo ente. — Sed peccatum nominatur ens, & affectionem cum quodam defectu; defectus autem ille est ex causa creaturae scilicet lib. arbit. Aquin. 12. q. 79. a. 2.

For a wicked work may be considered as a work, and as wicked. As a work, so it is from God, who is the supreme cause of every thing that hath any efficacy, or being in it. But it is not from God, as it is wicked; for so it imports defect, and therefore is not to be ascribed unto God, who cannot any way

be defective, but it is to be imputed onely to the creature. But though God be now the author of mens wicked works as they are wicked, yet is he the orderer and disposer of them. And thus Luther might well say, It is not in mans power to make his prayers vail, viz. so as he himself will, but as God will, who permitteth, restraineth, ordereth, and disposeth mans prayers as he pleaseth. Thus, as the Prophet saith, The way of man is not in himself, neither is it in man that walketh, to direct his steps, Jer. 10. 23.

Deus mirabili potentia regit corda tuum impiorum, & impedit ne aliud perficiant, conentur, velint, cogitent, quam quod ipse permittit, ipsamque culpam eis vertit in poenitentiam, sed multa bona malis eorum voluntatibus ipse summe potens, summeq; bonus utitur. Bellar. de omni. grat. & statu peccati lib. 2. cap. 16.

of much good. And

Non facit voluntates malas, sed utitur eis ut voluerit. Aug. apud Bellar. ibid.
Deus non solum permittit impiorum

direct his steps, Jer. 10. 23. Bellarmine himselfe doth tell us, That God by his wonderful power doth rule the hearts even of the wicked, and doth restrain them so that they cannot effect, endeavour, will, or think otherwise then he doth permit, and doth turn their fault into their punishment; and being both most powerful, and most good, doth use their evil wills for the accomplishing of much good. And hee cites Augustine saying, That God doth not make mens wills evil, but hee maketh use of them as he pleaseth. But the Cardinal speaks yet more fully: God (saith he) doth not onely permit the wicked

to do many evil things, but also is president over their evil wills, and doth rule and govern them, yea wrest and bend (N.B.) by working invisibly in them; so that although they be evil through their own fault, yet by the divine providence, not positively, but permissively they are ordered to one evil, rather than to another. This expression, which Bellarmine here useth of Gods wrestling and bending the wills of wicked men in their wicked designs, is (I think) as high as any that either Luther or Calvin do use, of whom yet the Romanists, and amongst them Bellarmine himselfe complains, as making God the authour of sinne, though they disclaim and abhor the Position as much as they that are so invective against them,

Before the Marquesse hath fully done with Luther, he hath by the way assling at Zuinglius, saying that he denies all Pauls Epistles to be sacred. But in the place cited I finde it otherwise. Zuinglius doth not deny all Pauls Epistles to be sacred, yea he saith expressly that he doth not deny this; onely he saith, that Paul then when he wrote, did not attribute so much to his Epistles, as that whatsoever was contained in them, should be sacred; he thought that if the Apostolic had done so, it had been too much arrogancy in him; wherein I am far from being of his minde.

There is nothing material, which the Marquesse here doth further alledge against Luther; onely he citeth two or three passages, wherein Luther doth vaunt of himself, which though it may perhaps argue some vanity of the man, yet doth it not argue any falsity of his doctrine. I never required (saith Luther) that any should account me modest, or holy, but that all should embrace the Gospel. Yet might he without any vain boasting say, (as the Marquesse objecteth Page 170.) that he would

agere multa mala, &c. sed etiam presideret ipsis voluntatibus malis, easque regere & gubernare, torquet ac flectit in eis invisibiliter operando; ut licet vitio proprio male sint, tamen à divina providentiâ ad unum potius malum, quàm ad aliud, non positive, sed permissive ordinantur. Bellar. ibid. cap. 13.

Quasi vero Paulus Epistolis suis jam tum tribueret, ut quicquid in eis contineretur sacrosanctum esset. Non quod ipse velim non sacrosancta esse, quæ illius sint, sed quod noim Apostolis imputari immoderaram arrogantiam, &c. Zuingl. tom. 2. fol. 10.

Nunquam exegi ut me quis modestum aut sanctum haberet, sed ut Evangelium omnes agnoscerent. Luth. ad Præfat. Latomi.

not have his doctrine to be judged either by Men or Angels; that is, he being assured of its truth, and agreeableness to Gods word, he would not refer it to the censure either of Men or Angels, so as to submit unto them if they should condemn it. In this he had respect (it seems) to that of the Apostle, *Though we, or an Angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed*, Gal. 1. 8. And thus much for answer to those things which are alledged against Luther.

Pag. 8c.

Of Calvins
Doctrine.

Obj.

Ans.

In the next place the Marquess fals upon Calvin, and brings many charges against him; but by the examination of the matter it will appear, that Calvin is altogether as injuriously dealt with as Luther, if not more.

1. He maintaineth (its said) that three Essences do arise out of the holy Trinity.

I wish the Marquess had either cited Calvin's words, or at least the place so, as that I might have found what he saith. But he onely citeth *Truth. Theol. p. 793.* Where in the Edition which I have (*viz. Genev. an. 1576.*) is no such thing to be found. Neither need I to search into Calvin's Works for the answering of this charge. Bellarmine himself (who would have been ready enough to find out any such grosse stuffe in him) doth justifie him in this point, confessing that Calvin doth acknowledge onely one nature in three distinct persons. And that he doth plainly say,

Calvinus facitur lib. 1. Instit. cap. 13. sect. 13. Unam numero naturam esse in tribus distinctis personis. Bellar. de Christi. lib. 6. c. 19. Præterea ibid. sect. 23. aperte dicit, essentiam à Patre, Filio esse communicatam. Bellar. ibid.

that the Essence is communicated to the Son by the Father: which also doth take away the next charge, viz. *That the Son hath his substance distinct from the Father; and that he is a distinct God from the Father.* By Bellarmine's own confession Calvin's doctrine is directly contrary.

Obj.

2. He teacheth (saith the Marquess:) That the Father can neither wholly, nor by parts communicate his nature to Christ, but must withall be deprived thereof himself.

Ans.

Si in essentia est discretio, respondeant, an non cum Filio eam communicaverit?

This is clearly confuted by Calvin's words which Bellarmine alledgeeth: *If there be any difference in the Essence (viz. of the Father and the Son)*

Let

let them answer whether the Father did communicate it to the Son, or no? Now this could not be in part; for it is not lawfull to make half a God. Besides by this means they should foully tear in peeces Gods Essence. It remains, that the whole and intire Essence is common to the Father and the Son.

3. Calvin is said to deny that the Son is begotten of the Fathers *Obj.*
 substance, and to affirm that he is God of himself, not God of God.

Divers Romanists besides, and before the Marquesse *Ans.*
 would make Calvin guilty of some grosse heresie, in saying

that the Son is, *aisé de* God of himself. But Bellarmine hath a whole Chapter about this very point, and doth clear Calvin from that aspersion which others cast upon him, shewing that he spake of the Son, not in respect of his Person, but in respect of his Essence; and that his meaning is, that the Person of the Son is begotten of the Father, but that the Essence of the Son is not begotten, nor produced, but is of it self. So another learned Jesuite, viz. Gregorius de Valentia (as I finde him cited) doth ingenuously confesse, that Calvins doctrine in this point, being rightly understood, is sound and true, viz. That the Son as he is essentially God, is of himself, and only is from the Father as he is a Person. When the Fathers and Councils affirm the Son to be God of God, he saith, they take the word God personally, viz. as it signifieth both the Person of the Father, and of the Son: yet (saith he) the Son, as he is essentially God, so he is not from another. And in this sense he saith Epiphanius seemeth to have called the Son *aisé de*, that is, God of himself.

Hoc verò non potuit esse ex parte, quia dimidium fabricare Deum nefas esset. Adde quod hòc modo scèdè lacerarent Dei essentiam. Restat ut tota & in solidum Patris & Filii sit communis. Calvin Instit. lib. 1. cap. 13. sect. 23. citat. à Bellar. ubi supra.

Dum rem ipsam excutio, & Calvinis sententias diligenter considero, non facile audeo pronuntiare illum in hoc errore fuisse, siquidem docet Filium esse à se respectu essentiz, non respectu personæ, & videtur dicere velle, personam esse genitam à Patre, essentiam non esse genitam, nec productam, sed esse à seipso, &c. Bellar. loc. antè citato.

Revera si attentè Calvinus legatur, tantum videbitur voluisse, Filium, ut Deus quidem essentialiter est, ex se esse, & solummodo ut persona est, esse ex Patre. Id quod verum est. Nam licet verissimè Patres & Concilia asserant, Deum esse ex Deo, accipiendo vocabulum Dei personaliter, ut scilicet significat quoque personam ipsam Patris & Filii; tamen Filius quatenus essentialiter Deus est, id est, ut est illud simplicissimum quod est Deus, non est ab alio, quia ut sic est quid absolute. — In eo sensu videtur Filium appellasse *aisé de* Epiph. hæc. 69. Greg. de Valent. citat. à Rivet in Gen. exercit. 14.

4. He taketh Calvin for saying, That dream of the absolute power of God, which the Schoolmen have brought in, is execrable blasphemy.

Calvin in one of the places alledged (for the other I cannot consult) saith thus: Neither do we bring in the device of absolute power; which as it is profane, so we have just cause to detest it. But Calvin was far from denying that absolute power of God, whereby he is able to do whatsoever he pleaseth: Only he seems to deny God to

have such an absolute power, as to be able to do any thing, whether it be right or wrong. For he adds immediately, We do not feign God to be without law, who is a law unto himself.

Obj. 5. It is objected against Calvin, that those words, The Father is greater then I, (Joh. 14. 28.) he will not have restrained to the humane nature, but will extend them to Christ as God and man.

Ans. Many places are cited for proof of this; some whereof, for want of the same Edition, though I have the book, I cannot examine, viz. *Tract. Theol.* p. 794 & 792. my book in those pages hath nothing to the purpose. And so also it is in all other places, where the Marquess doth cite those *Theological Tractates*. Another place here also the Marquess citeth, which is as if it were not cited, viz. Calvin on *Mat. 22.* the verse being not mentioned, the quotation is to no purpose. Two other places he cites also, viz. Calvin *Instit.* l. 2. c. 14. §. 3. and on *Joh. 17. 12.* but in neither of these places doth Calvin speak any thing about those words, My Father is greater then I. It may seem strange, that the Marquess should here cite so many places out of Calvin's Works, and yet pretermitt his Commentary upon those very words about which he taketh him. Now Calvin commenting upon those words, saith, That the Arians did wickedly abuse this testimony, to prove that Christ is but a secondary God, and not equal with the Father; and that yet on the other side,

Variè detortus fuit hic locus. Ariani, ut Christum probarent quendam secundarium esse Deum, objiciebant minorem esse Patre. Patres orthodoxi, ut tali calumniz ansam præciderent, dicebant hoc debere ad naturam huma-

the

Orthodox Fathers did not rightly interpret the words of Christs humane nature: For that here neither Christs humane nature, nor his eternal divinity (he saith) is spoken of; but Christ according to the weaknesse of our capacity doth set himselfe in the midst betwixt God and us. He explains it further thus: Christ (saith he) doth not compare his Father's Divinity with his own, nor doth he compare his humane nature with his Fathers divine essence; but rather his present estate with that heavenly glory, into which he was by and by to be received. Though *Calvins* exposition here may seem somewhat quaint, neither do I see why the received interpretation should not stand, viz. that Christ spake of himselfe, as he was man; yet however *Calvin* plainly shews, that he was farre from having any compliance with the *Arians*, in denying the equality of the Sonne with the Father.

6. *Calvin* is charged to sever the person of the Mediator from Christs divine person; and to maintain with *Nestorius*, two persons in Christ, the one humane, and the other divine.

Calvin had nothing to do with the heresie of *Nestorius*, neither do the places alledged prove him any whit guilty of it.

He speaks indeed of the person of the Mediator, yet doth he not make that a distinct person from Christs divine person. I meddle not yet (saith he) with the person of Mediator. And again, We do not yet speak of the person of Mediator.

His meaning plainly is this, and no more then this; that as yet he spake of Christ only as God, and not as Mediator. And when he saith, that Christ took upon him the person and office of Mediator, he seems to take the word person not for that which in Greek is *hypostasis*, a substance subsisting by it self; but as the Latines frequently use the word for quality, or state. Thus he

nam referri. Arqui ut impiè hoc testimonio abusi sunt Ariani, ita nec recta nec consentanea fuit Patrum solutio. Hic enim neque de humanâ Christi naturâ, neque de æterna ejus divinitate sermo habetur; sed pro infirmitatis nostræ caput, se medium inter nos & Deum constituit. Uterque claris pateat, crassius adhuc loquendum est. Non confert hic Christus Patris divinitatem cum suâ, nec humanam suam naturam divinæ Patris essentiz omparam; sed potius statum præsentem celestis gloriæ, ad quam mox recipiendus erat, &c. *Calv. ad Joh. 24. 28.*

Obj.

Ans.

Mediatoris personam nondum attingo. *Calv. Instit. lib. 1. cap. 13. sect. 9.* Nondum de Mediatoris personâ nobis sermo est. *sect. 23.* Mediatoris suscepit personam & munus. *sect. 24.*

Genere personam attingit, nam aliquis, &c. *Vide Vallam Elegant. lib. 6. cap. 34.*

seems

seems to use the word *Person*, in that after it immediately he adds the word *office*. However, *Calvin* doth expressly condemn the heresie of *Nestorius*, and hath

Procul abigendus est à nobis Nestorii error. — 1a Ephesinà synodo merito damnatus fuit Nestorius. *Calv. Inst. l. 2. cap. 14. sect. 4. Similiter etiam sect. 5.*

a whole Chapter to prove that in Christ two natures make but one Person. *Calvin* therefore here hath hard measure, being charged with *Nestorianisme*, when as he not only in plaine tearms doth explode it, but also doth bend his whole force against it.

Obj. 7. *Calvin* is taxed for saying, That *Christs* soule was subject to ignorance; and that this was the only difference betwixt us and him, that our infirmities are of necessity, and his were voluntary.

Ans.

It is true, *Calvin* understands that *Luke 2. 40. and 52. so*, as that Christ as man was not perfect in knowledge at first, no more then he was in stature. And surely this seems to be the plain and simple meaning of the words, especially those *v. 52. And Jesus increased in wisdom, and stature;* though other expound them, that as Christ grew in age, so he did shew forth his wisdom more and more. But *Jansenius* confesseth that *Ambrose* saith, that Christ as

Ambrosius hoc loco fateatur Christum secundum quod homo erat, profecisse. — Et sub nomine Theophili in catena aurea legitur, &c. Proficere dicitur ex eo, quod humanitas proficiebat in ipso. *Jansen. Concord. cap. 12.*

man did grow in knowledge. And that the same exposition also is found under the name of *Theophilus*, another ancient Author. He addes indeed, that these sayings of the Ancients

are well understood by the Schoolmen of Christ's wisdom acquired by use and experience, when as before from his first conception he had the knowledge of all things infused into him. Yet he speaks of this infused knowledge only as a thing which he thought very probable, not as a thing which he held most certain. And he confesseth that some (I presume he means of the Church of *Rome*; for otherwise he would not so much regard what they thought) are of opinion, that it cannot be proved by Scripture, that

Omniñò videatur Christo etiam quatenus homini tribuendam perfectam omnium rerum à conceptione cognitionem ei infusam. — Omniñò verisimile est, &c. *Jans. ibid.*
Verùm cum sapientiam hanc, quæ Christo tanquam homini ab initio conceptionis sit infusa, quæque omnia ab initio cognovisset, etiam ut homo, quidam putent non posse ex Scripturis

such

such wisdom was infused into Christ from his conception, whereby as man he should know all things at the very first: and therefore they think the words of S. Luke more simply understood thus, that Christ in respect of that wisdom which he had as man, did truly grow, as other men do, though in a far greater measure. Thus also did Erasmus (who was before Calvin) understand it, not thinking it meet that the opinion of the Schoolmen should sway in this matter.

8. Of like nature is that which followeth, viz. that Calvin saith, *It is evident that ignorance was common to Christ with the Angels.* And that he particularizeth wherein, viz. that he knew not the day of judgment; nor that the fig-tree was barren, till he came near it.

That Christ as man, knew not what kind of tree it was, until he came nigh it, Calvin thinks not improbable; yet he grants, that Christ might on purpose go unto it, though he were not ignorant of the event. Concerning the other place, viz. Mar. 13. 32. he is more confident; and so well might he be, the Text being clear and expresse: *But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* Some understand it so, that Christ did not know it, to make it known: But thus neither doth the Father know it; for he doth not make it known. It is therefore to be understood of Christ in respect of his humane nature. And so Cyril understands it, as Jansenius confesseth, though he himself rather likes the other exposition.

9. The Marquesse saith, that Calvin is not afraid to censure certain words of Christ to be but a weak confutation of what he sought to refute. And that he saies, Christ seems here not to reason solidly.

probari, putant simpliciter hunc locum sic explicandum, ut dicatur Christum secundum sapientiam divinam, h. e. eam quæ ei competit tanquam Deo, non profecisse; secundum sapientiam autem humanam, h. e. eam, quæ ei ut homini competit, verè profecisse, hominum quidem more, sed tamen supra modum humanum. Jansen, ibid.

Neque verò perinde nos movet, si id pugnet cum aliquo placito Scholasticorum, &c. Eras. ad Luc. 2. 52.

Obj.

Ans.

Nihil absurdum est, si dicamus, secundum hominem speciem arboris fuisse illi incognitam; fieri tamen potest, ut consulto accesserit, eventum non ignorans. Calv. ad Mat. 21. 18.

Certe Cyrilus lib. 9. Thessal. cap. 4. factus Christus de se, quatenus homo erat, dixisse, quod ignoraret diem judicii, &c. Jansen, Concord. cap. 123.

Obj.

Ddd

This

Answ. This is just as if one should charge their Angelical Doctor *Aquinas* with saying, That there seems to be no God, and that, God seems to be a body : Or rather indeed with saying, That there is no God, and that God is a body. For thus is *Calvin* dealt with,

commenting upon that, *Matth. 12.25,26.* Every Kingdome divided against it self, &c. If Satan cast out Satan, &c. by way of objection he saith, This confutation may seem not very solid; and then immediately he answers the objection. Thus also in his Commen-

tary upon that *Mat. 9.5.* Whether is easier to say, &c. Christ (saith he) doth seem not to reason solidly, &c. Then presently he addes, But the answer is easie, &c. Of this same nature are the five next following passages,

wherein *Calvin* is made to say that, which (as the manner of Expositors is for the better elucidating of that which they have in hand) he only brings in as an objection, and presently gives answer to it. This is a peece of the strangest dealing that ever I met with. I do not finde that the *Marquesse* had these allegations from any, as many of the rest (I see) he had : neither can I think him to have been of such an ignoble disposition, as wittingly and wilfully so to pervert a mans words and meaning. Therefore I suppose it was his immoderate desire to finde any thing in *Calvin*, that might be liable to exception, which made him hastily take hold of that which did occur, never considering the true sense and meaning of it. But to proceed.

Obj. 10. *Calvin* (saith the *Marquesse*) saith, that Christ refused and denied, as much as lay in him, to perform the office of a Mediator.

Answ. It's true, *Calvin* hath these words; but they also are part of an objection. For the very next word is, *Respondeo*, I answer. So that I might have joyned this with those other passages immediately before mentioned; though there seems indeed some more colour for this allegation then for the others,

Videtur quod Deus non sit. Aquin. part. 1. qu. 2. art. 3.
Videtur quod Deus sit corpus. Ibid. quest. 3. art. 2.

Videtur tamen paulum solida esse refutatio, &c. Verum nulla in Christum cecidit talis suspicio, &c. Calv. ad Mat. 12.25.

Videtur tamen paulum solidè ratiocinari Christus, &c. Sed in promptu est solutio, &c. Calv. ad Mat. 9.5.

Calv. ad Mat. 26.39.

other, yet is there no just ground for this neither.

11. The next charge against *Calvin* is, that he saith, That *Obj.*
Christ manifested his own effeminate-ness, by his shunning of death.

This also is of like nature with the former. *Calvin* wri- *Ans.*
ting upon those words, *Joh. 12. 27.*

Now is my soul troubled, &c. saith, that this doth seem to differ much from that which is next before. For that there *Christ* shewed great courage, exhorting his Disciples not only to suffer death, but to suffer it willingly and desirously, if the case so require; but now by shunning death, he confesseth his weaknesse (or softnesse) of spirit. Then he addes by way of answer, that yet here is nothing which doth not very well agree. That it was expedient

Videtur initio sententia hæc multum discrepare à proximo sermone. Illud plusquam heroici pectoris signum erat, hortari suos non modò ad subeundam mortem, sed libenter & cupidè oppetendam, ubi res ita postulat: nunc mortem fugiendo mollietatem suam fatetur. Nihil tamen hic legimus, quod non optimè conveniat, &c. Cæterum saluti nostræ utile fuit, imò necessarium, sic affici Filium Dei. — Sciamus ergo mortem non fuisse delicias, aut lulum Christo, &c. Calvin. ad Job. 12. 27.

and necessary for our salvation that the Son of God should be so affected. And that hence we are to know, that *Christ's* death was no sport or play unto him, &c. So then the word *molities* (which the *Marquess* rendreth *effeminate-ness*, and not unfitly, I confesse, for it properly signifieth *soft-ness*, and is used for *softnesse of spirit*) that word, I say, is here applied to *Christ* in a way of * objection, though *Calvin* doth positively aver, that *Christ* was deeply affected with the horror of his approaching death; and that he was so indeed; is most evident both by this, and other places of the Evangelical history.

* *Scornful men-nes, as Calvin (speaks) are apt to interpret Christ's fear of death. effeminate-ness.*

12. The *Marquess* addes, He saith that *Tbeeves and Male-factors* hasten to death with obstinate resolution, despising it with baughty courage, others mildly suffer it. But what constancie, courage, or stoutnesse was there in the Son of God, who was astonished, and in a manner stricken dead with fear of death? How shameful a tendernesse was it to be so far tormented with fear of common death, as to melt in bloody sweat, and not be able to be comforted but by the sight of Angels? *Obj.*

Calvin disputes against those who would have it only a

Convicti ad aliud tandem cavillum transiliunt, quamvis mortem timuerit Christus, maledictionem & iram Dei, à qua se tutum esse noverat, non timuisse. Sed expendant pii lectores, quam honorificum hoc sit Christo, quam molliorem ac magis meticulosum fuisse, quam plebsque gregarios homines. Contumaciter ad mortem properant latrones, &c. *Calv. Instit. lib. 2. cap. 16. sect. 12.*

meerbodily death, not having any curse and wrath of God annexed to it, which Christ did fear. But (saith he) let the godly Readers consider, how honourable this is for Christ, to have been more effeminate and faint-hearted then most ordinary men. Then follow the words objected, *Therewas and other Malefactors do hasten unto death with obstinate resolution, &c.* The series of the Discourse

doth plainly shew, that Calvin speaks not positively, but upon supposition, that if it were so, as some hold, then all this would follow; which he is so farre from asserting, that by the absurdity of it, he proves the erroniousness of their opinion whom he doth confute.

Obj.

* Rather it should be, took from Christ, &c.

13. The Marquesse proceeds in his charge against Calvin, saying, He saith that the same vehemencie took * Christ from the present memory of the heavenly decree; so that he forgot at that instant, that he was sent thither to be our Redeemer.

Ans.

This allegation I grant, is true. Calvin on Mat. 26. 39. hath these words indeed; neither will I undertake the defence of all Calvin's expressions, or opinions: I think it not so safe to ascribe forgetfulness unto Christ, though as Calvin meant it, I do not see that there is any impiety in it. And the word *indignus*, Mar. 14. 33. importing horror, and

Tenendum quidem est, quod nuper dixi, non fuisse turbulentos Christi affectus, qui more nostro ejus animopuram moderationem exciterent, &c. *Calv. ad Mat. 26. 39. ibid. Resp.* non posse in hac naturæ nostræ corruptione perspicui affectuum fervorem cum temperie qualis in Christo fuit. *Vide plura. Et vide Instit. l. 2. c. 16. sect. 12.*

astonishment, may seem to make for it. However Calvin was carefull to inculcate this, that he would have none to think that there was any turbulence and disorder in Christ's affections, as there is in ours; but onely that Christ was stricken with fear and anxiety so far forth as the sound and intire nature of man can bear.

Obj.

14. Calvin is taxed for saying, That Christ's prayer was not premeditate, but the force and extremity of grief wringed from him this hasty speech, to which a correction was presently added, and he chastiseth, and recalleth that vow of his, which he had let suddenly slip.

I ac-

I acknowledge that *Calvin* hath these words in the same place, viz. on *Mat. 26. 39.* neither do I much approve of them: yet by what hath been said already, it may appeare that *Calvins* meaning was good, only so to set forth the anxiety of Christs soul, as yet to exempt him from whatsoever is evil and sinful. *Bellarmine* himself, though he rake up, and rack *Calvins* sayings, to make them odious, yet confesseth that he saith, that *Christs* nature was perfect, and that there was no inordinacie of affections in him. But I will make use of the words of learned *Dr. Field*, who hath answered these objections against *Calvin*, long ago.

The *Papists* (saith he) impute I know not what blasphemy to *Calvin*, for that he saith, Christ corrected the desire and wish that suddenly came from him. But they might easily understand, if they pleased, that he is far from thinking, that any desire, or expressing of desire was sudden in Christ, as rising in him without consent of reason, or that he was inconsiderate in any thing he did or spake; but his meaning is, that some desires which he expressed, proceeded from inferior reason, that considereth not all circumstances; and that he corrected and revoked the same; not as evil, but as not proceeding from the full and perfect consideration of all things fit to be thought upon, before a full resolution be passed. Another learned man also saith, that *Calvin* calls those words, *Neverthelless not as I will, but as thou wilt*, a correction, in that sense as *Rhetoricians* are wont to use the figure so called: not as if he did amend that which was ill spoken, but seasonably to add that which yet was not spoken. And he cites *Origen* saying, that Christ did in those words recall his desire, and as it were recogitate. So likewise he cites *Hierome*, and the *Interlineary Glosse*, saying, that Christ did return into himself. *Hierome* doth yet further paraphrase thus: *He saith, Let*

Ans.

Dicit (Calvinus) Christi naturam fuisse perfectam; & nullam in eo fuisse passionum inordinationem. Bellar. de Christi lib. 4. cap. 8.

Dr. Field, of the Church, book 5 chap. 18.

Calvinus appellat posteriora hæc verba Non sicut ego, &c. correctionem, sed eo sensu, quo Rhetores correctionis figuræ uti solent; non quasi aliquod male effectum emendaret, sed ut quod adhuc effectum non erat, opportune adderet. Origen. revocans desiderium, & quasi recogitans. Hieron. Et Glos. interl. re-vertens in semetipsum. Parker (ni fallor, neque enim autem mihi liber est ad matrum) de descens. Christi. ad infer.

Non, inquit, hoc fiat, quod humano affectu loquor; sed propter quod ad terras tuas voluntate descendis. Hieron. ad Mat. 26. 39.

Relinquebat naturam humanam partes suas agere, quemadmodum egisset, si neque cum Divinitate conjuncta fuisset, nec de divino decreto quicquam scivisset. — Apte apposita moderatio: Sic enim naturæ infirmitatem ostendit, ut ultra divinæ voluntatis terminos non egrediatur. *Maldon. ad Mat. 26. 39.*

not that he, which I speak with a humane affection; but that, for which by thy will I descended to the earth. The Jesuite Maldonate saith, that Christ left the humane nature to all its part, as it would have done, if it had not been joyned with the divine nature, nor had known any thing of Gods decree. So

he writes upon those words, Father, if it be possible, &c. And upon those, Neverthelesse not as I will, &c. he saith, A moderation is fitly added: For he so shewes the infirmity of nature, that yet he does not exceed the bounds of Gods will. That which Maldonate here calls a moderation, and Hierome calls a retarning into himself, and Origen and the Glosse call a recalling of the desire, and a recogitating, is as much as that which Calvin calls a correction.

Obj.

15. But the Marquesse proceeds, and charges Calvin with these words: Thus we see Christ to be on all sides so vexed, as being overwhelmed with desperation, he ceased to call upon God, which was as much as to renounce his salvation: and this (the Marquesse saith, he saith a little before) was not fained, or as a thing only acted upon a stage.

Ans.

Surely all that have any spark of Christianity in them, must needs assent to Calvin in this, that Christs passion, as the Evangelists relate it, was not fained nor acted upon a stage; though (it seems) they of the Church of Rome on Good Friday (as they call it) use to make a kind of Stage-play of it. But how unworthily is Calvin here used? He is made to say, that Christ was overwhelmed with desperation, ceased to call upon God; and did as much as renounce his salvation. But any that look into the place alleadged, may see that Calvin is far from this blasphemy. That which he saith, is this, that the wicked enemies of Christ, by Satans instigation, deriding him when he cried, *Eli, Eli, &c.*

did

Nec verò sicut vel theatricè conqueritur se à Patre relictum. *Calv. ad Mat. 27.*

In die Parasceves crucifixus paulatim detegitur, & ostenditur. *Bezar. de Imag. Sanctior. lib. 2. cap. 23.*

Sic impios Christi hostes impulit, (nempe Satanas) ut protervè ejus precationem in risum converterent; volens hoc artificio cum præcipuis armis spoliare. Et certè hæc admodum gravis tentatio est, &c. Tantumdem igitur valuit hæc ironia, vel caninus latrans, ac si negassent Christo quicquam esse negotii cum Deo, quod Eliam implorans in aliud asylum se conferret. Sic vide-

did labour to overwhelm him with desperation, and to make him cease calling upon God, which had been as much as to renounce salvation.

As before *Calvin* was made positively to aver that, which hee brought in by way of objection; so here that is censured as spoken by him, which he only speaks of Christs enemies. But it is worthy to be observed, that immediately after those words, which are so pitifully perverted, *Calvin* comforts himself and others with this consideration, that if our words, which are right and good, be depraved and slandered, it is no marvel, seeing Christ himself was thus dealt with. But to proceed.

16. *Calvin* (as is alleadged) saith, That Christ in his soul suffered the terrible torments of a damned and forsaken man.

This allegation is true, and so also is that, which follows in the next passage but two, and I note it here, because it is of the same nature. It is no marvel, if it be said that Christ went down into hell, since he suffered that death, wherewith God in wrath striketh wicked doers. *Calvin* hath these sayings in the place alleadged, viz. Instit. lib. 2. cap. 16. sect. 10. I am not of *Calvins* mind for the meaning of the article about Christs descent into hell, as I have elsewhere shewed. And peradventure *Calvin* might go too far in exaggerating the sufferings of Christs soul, as others in this may be too remisse. But when *Calvin* speaketh of Christ suffering the torments of a damned man, he means such torments as are without all mixture of sin, for that he always removes far from Christ, as I have shewed before.

And that Christ did suffer the torments of a forsaken man, his own words upon the crosse do shew, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Christ had speciall cause (as *Jansenius* observes) to complaine, that he was forsaken of his God, in that he had the divine nature united to him, and his humane nature did not

mus omni ex parte fuisse vexatum, ut desperatione obrutus ab invocando Deo absteret; quod erat salutis renunciare, *Calvin. ad Mat. 27. 47.*

Ceterum si hodie tam conductici Antichristi rabulæ, quam domestici etiam nebulones, quæ à nobis rectè dicta sunt, suis calumniis indignè depravant, ne miremur idem nobis quod capiti nostro accidere. *Calvin. ibid.*

Obj.

Ans.

Serm. on Psal. 16. 10.

Propriâ quâdam ratione Christus & derelictum à Deo suo conqueri potuit, qui cum unitam sibi haberet divinitatem, ejus tamen consolationem in carne fecit

non sentit diffidam. *Jansen. concord.*
cap. 143.

feel any comfort of it. And in this respect it may be said, that Christ suffered that death, wherewith God in wrath doth strike wicked doers, though in other respects there was great difference.

Obj.

17. *Calvin is charged with this saying, In the death of Christ occurs a spectacle full of desperation.*

Ans.

Nunc dum in Christi morte spectaculum desperationis plenum occurrit, quod etiam viriles animos frangere posset, unde illi reperte tam generosa animositas, ut inter summos terrores nihil metuens, longius quam rebus paratis progredi non dubitet? *Calv. in Mat. 27. 57.*

Calvin's meaning will easily appear to any that look upon his words as they are in the place quoted. He speaks of Joseph of Arimathea his courage in begging of Pilate Christ's body to bury it, saying, Now when in Christ's death occurs a spectacle full of desperation, which might have been able to break a stout heart, whence hath he on the sudden such a generous spirit, that in the midst of terrors fearing nothing, he should not doubt to proceed further then when all was quiet? Any may here plainly see, that Calvin speaks not of any desperation that Christ in his death did fall into; but his meaning is, that a natural man, yea one that had but a small measure of faith, could have apprehended nothing in Christ's death but matter of desperation. And surely this appears by the words of the two Disciples (not to speak of the deportment of the Apostles) We trusted that it had been he that should have redeemed Israel, Luke 24. 21.

Another sentence is here immediately after cited out of Calvin, viz. In this spectacle there was nothing but matter of extreme despair. The very words shew it to carry the same sense with the former, though otherwise I can say nothing to it, the place from which it is taken being mis-cited; for on Job. 14. 6 Calvin hath no such thing.

Obj.

18. The Marquesse taxeth Calvin for saying, Christ sitting at the right hand of his Father, holds but a second degree with him in honour, and rule, and is but his Vicar.

Ans.

Calvin on Mat. 26. 64. doth say, That Christ is said to sit at the right hand of the Father, because he hath as it were after him the second seat of honour and rule; and because he is his Vicar. Dicitur autem Christus sedere ad dexteram Patris, quia summus rex constitutus (qui ejus nomine mundum gubernat) quasi secundum ab eo honoris & imperii sedem obtinet. Sedet ergo Christus ad Patris dexteram, quia ejus est Vicarius. *Calv. ad Mat. 28. 64.*

Vicar.

Vicar. So that Calvin indeed doth not say, that Christ sitting at the right hand of his Father; but, that Christ as sitting at the right hand of his Father, holds but a second degree, &c. that is, that Christs sitting at the right hand of God, though it import great honour and dignity, yet such, as whereby Christ is but in a second degree of honour under the Father. And surely this is most true, it belonging unto Christ as man, to sit at the right hand of God, (as the Council of Trents Catechisme doth teach) the honour and dignity which that sitting imports, though otherwise it be most great, yet must needs be inferior to that, which belongs to the Father and so also to Christ, as he is one and the same God with the Father.

19. *Lastly* (saith the Marqueſſe) Calvin holds it absurd, that Christ should challenge to himself the glory of his own resurrection, when the Scripture every where teacheth it to be the work of the Father.

It may seem wonderful, that mens words and writings should be thus depraved. Two places of Calvin are cited for proof of this which is alledged against him. Now in the former place, viz. on Job. 2. 19. he saith thus. Here Christ doth challenge to himself the glory of his resurrection, when as the Scripture usually doth testifie that this is the work of God the Father. But these two do well agree together. For the Scripture, to commend unto us Gods power, doth expressly ascribe this to the Father, that he raised his Son from the dead: but here Christ peculiarly sets forth his own Divinity. And Paul doth reconcile both, Rom. 8. 11. For the Spirit, which he maketh to be the Author of the resurrection, he promiscuously calls sometimes the Spirit of Christ, sometimes the Spirit of the Father. So also in the other place, viz. on Rom. 8. 11. Surely (saith he) Christ rose again of himself, and by his own power: But

Ad explicandum Christi gloriam, quam ut homo præ cæteris omnibus adeptus est, cum in Patris dextra esse confitemur. Catech. Council. Trident.

Obj.

Ans

Hic sibi Christus resurrectionis gloriam vindicat; quum tamen Scriptura passim testetur esse opus Dei Patris. Sed hæc duo probe inter se conveniunt. Scriptura enim, ut Dei potentiam nobis commendet, Patri hoc diserte adscribit, quod excitaverit Filium a morte: hic vero Christus peculiariter Divinitatem suam prædicat. Ac Paulus utrumque conciliat ad Rom. 8. 11. nam Spiritum; quem facit resurrectionis auctorem, promiscue nunc Christi, nunc Patris Spiritum nominat. Calv. ad Job. 2. 19.

Spirit of the Father.

A seipso certe ac propria virtute Christus resurrexit: Sed quemadmodum

solet Patri transcribere quicquid in se
divinae virtutis est, ka apostolus non
improprie ad Patrem transiit, quod
fuit in Christo maxime proprium opus.
Calv. ad Rom. 8.11.

as he used to transcribe to the Father what-
soever divine power is in him, so the Apostle
doth not improperly transcribe to the Father
that which was Christs most proper work.
Who doth not now see, that Calvin
is most farre from saying that, which is charged upon
him?

Obj. 20. But the Marquesse (notwithstanding the word lastly
did seem to speak as much) hath not yet done with Calvin;
but further taxeth him for saying, God is author of all those
things, which these Popish Judges would have to happen by his idle
sufferance.

Ans. Calvin in the place cited, not barely saith that it is so,
but saith that he hath plainly shewed
by Scripture that it is so. And therefore
it had been meet that Calvins proofs
should have been examined, before his
doctrine were condemned. Calvin ab-
horres that position, that God is the
author of sinne; as may be seen in the very next Section
to that which the Marquesse citeth: Yet he proveth by
many places of Scripture, that God doth not onely per-
mit those things wherein men sinne, but also in some
respect is the author of them: As for example, that God
was the author of Simeon's cursing; not as it was his sinne,
but as it was Davids affliction. So David acknowledged,
saying, The LORD hath said unto him, curse David,
2 Sam. 16. 10. And again, v. 11. The LORD hath bidden
him.

Obj. 21. The next and last charge against Calvin, is little or
nothing different from that immediately preceding, viz.
that he saith, Our finnes are not only by Gods *permission, but by
his decree and will.

Ans. The Marquesse speaks of Calvins famous brethren con-
demning this blasphemy. But they, whom he mentioneth,
are (I think) all Lutherans, and so ready to make the worst
they can of any thing that they finde in Calvin. But where-
as in the conclusion he saith, What Scriptures or Fathers is
there

there for all this? Surely Calvin hath alledgeed many Scriptures:

for that which he asserteth; which it had been meet to take some notice of, as I have said before. He also cites *Austine* determining thus, That men sinne, it is of themselves; but that by sinning they doe this or that, it is by the power of God, who divideth the darkness as he pleaseth.

Quod autem nihil efficient homines nisi arcant Dei nostri, &c. innumerus & claris testimonis probatur, *Calv. Inst. l. 1. c. 18. sect. 1.* Non male alicubi Augustinus ita desinit, quod ipsi peccant, totum est; quod peccando boni vel illi agant, ex virtute Dei esse, tenebras prout visum est dividendis. *Calvin. Instit. lib. 2. cap. 4. sect. 4.*

And thus have I also answered those things that are in point of Doctrine objected against Calvin.

After Calvin the Marquesse deals with *Zuinglius*, and objects divers things against his Doctrine.

1. *Zuinglius* (saith the Marquesse) confesseth himself to have been instructed against the Masse, by a certain admonisher, which he says he knew not; whether it was black or white.

It is true, *Zuinglius* relates, how having disputed with a Scribe about the meaning of those words, *This is my body*, and having been urged to produce some place, which is not a parable, where the word is doth import as much as *signifieth*, he was much troubled about it in his sleep, and thought had one (whether black or white, he could not remember) stood by him, and bade him alledge that in Exod. 12. 11. It is the Lords Passover. Whereupon he awaked, and rose, and considered the place, and presently after preached upon it, so that such as did a little stick before, were fully satisfied.

Now though Mr. Breerley, and after him the Marquesse Breerl. *Apol. tract. 2. cap. 2. sect. 11. subdi. vi. 2.* make a great matter of this, and say that is derided by learned Protestants (they cite some Lutherans, as great adversaries to *Zuinglius* in the matter of the Sacrament, as the Papists are) yet I see nothing in it that is liable to any just exception. For it is usuall with men to be troubled in their sleep about that wherein they have been busied before; and

Of *Zuinglius*
his Doctrine

Obj.

Page 184.
&c.

Ans.

Vilius sum mihi in somno, multo cum recto deus contendere cum adversario Scriba, &c. Minus alius quam sompnium narramus, quod addit attingit, manifestum non est, quod per somnum ad iudicium, gratia Deo, &c.) Ibi etiam in somno visus est monitor ad se (acer, niger, an albus, nihil memini) somnium enim narro.) qui dixit, Quia ignoscis respondes ei, quod Exo. 12. scribitur, Iste enim Phasce, h. e. transitus Domini. Proinus ut hoc phasma visum est simul exspecto, &c. *Zuingl. lib. 2. sect. 49.*

sometimes it happens, that in their sleep that is represented unto them, which before with all their study they could not finde out. As *Austine* somewhere (I do not now remember the place, but I have read it in him) tels of one that taught Rhetorick, and being troubled about the meaning of something that he met with, and was to treat of to his Schollars, in his sleep he thought that *Austine* did explain it unto him. But that which here they take hold of, perhaps is this, that *Zuinglius* saith, he did not know whether his admonisher were black or white; they seem to understand this so, as if he knew not whether that admonisher were an evill, or a good spirit. But if they so take it, they bewray too much ignorance of the Latine tongue, wherein it is usual, and indeed a proverbial speech to say, *I know not whether he be black or white*; that is, he is

Albus an ater sis, nescio. Solec dici de homine vehementer ignoto. *Eras.*
Adag. cent. 6. adag. 99.

one altogether unknown unto me. *Erasmus* in his *Adages* sufficiently shews this to be the meaning of the words, and cites *Cicero*, *Quintilian*, *Apuleius*, *Hierome*, using them in this sense.

Obj. 2. The Marquesse saith that *Zuinglius* is taxed by *Calvin* for depraving the Scripture, for changing the word *est*, and putting in *significat*, in his Translation of the New Testament.

Answ. But the Marquesse doth not tell us, where *Calvin* doth thus tax *Zuinglius*; and I suspect that there is some mistake in that word *Calvin*, and that it should be some other name.

Obj. 3. Hee chargeth *Zuinglius* with saying, that these sayings, and the like, *If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the Commandements, &c.* are superfluous, and hyperbolical.

Answ. But in the place alladged, viz. *Tom. 1. Fol. 137.* *Zuinglius* hath no such matter, there is no mention made of those words, *If thou wilt enter into life, &c.*

Obj. 4. *Zuinglius* is taxed for saying, that Original sinne
 * cannot damne us; calling it but a disease, or contagion.

* It is mis-
 printed can
 damn us.

Answ. It is true, *Zuinglius* saith, that Original sin is a disease, but such

such an one as of it selfe is not capable, nor can infer damnation, except a man being corrupted with this contagion transgress the Law of God, which then useth to happen, when he sees and understands the Law given unto him. And in this I plead not for *Zuinglius*, I confesse he erred, and is worthy to be taxed. But I do not know any Protestants that do condemn him in this; I speak not of *Socinians*, *Arminians*, &c. but such as are otherwise sound and orthodox. Neither should the Romanists here so much tax *Zuinglius*, seeing they hold that Concupiscence after Baptisme, though it remain the same that it was before, is in it self properly no sinne, but is onely called sinne, because it proceeds from sinne, and inclines unto sinne. Yea they hold, that had man been created (as they suppose he might have been) in his pure naturals, that is, in a meer natural condition, not having any supernatural grace superadded to his nature, he should have had the same concupiscence, which now he hath in the state of corrupt nature. The state of man since the fall of *Adam* (they say) doth not differ more from the state of man in his pure naturals; then one that is stripped of his cloaths differs from one that is naked, having never had cloaths. And therefore (they say) the corruption of mans nature doth not proceed from the want of any natural gift; nor from the access of any evill quality, &c. Its true, some of the Romish writers are of another opinion; but *Bellarmino* shews that the most of them hold thus; yea he allcades, that this is the determination of two Popes; and that therefore all ought to hold it.

5. *Zuinglius* is said to make baptizing of Infants a thing indifferent, which may be used or left off.

Zuinglius complains of the *Catabaptists* in his time, for keeping such a stirre because children were baptized,

Ecc 3

saying,

Unde colligimus, peccatum originale morbum quidem esse, qui tamen perse culpabilis non est, nec damnationis poenam inferre potest, &c. donec homo contagione hac corruptus Legem Dei transgredietur, quod tum deum fieri consuevit, cum Legem sibi positam videret, & intelligit. *Zuingl. de Baptism. 2. fol. 90.*

Some endeavor to excuse *Zuinglius* in this, but I see not how he can be excused.

Bellar. de amic. grat. & stat. peccat. lib. 5. cap. 7. Bellar. de grat. primi. how. cap. 5.

Quare non magis differt status hominis post lapsum Adæ à statu ejusdem in puris naturalibus, quam differt spoliatus à nudo. — Proinde corruptio naturæ non ex alicujus doni naturalis carentiâ, neque ex alicujus malæ qualitatis accessu, sed ex solâ doni supernaturalis ob Adæ peccatum amissione perfluit. *Bell. ibid.*

Bell. ibid.

Obj.

Ans.

Nunc tunc momenti res haec est, ut
tempus curas & sollicitudines propter hanc
excitare conveniat; etiam parvulo-
rum baptismus nulli omnino Scrip-
turae testimonio innititur; exter-
num quiddam est, & ceremoniale, quo
ut alius non existat, ecclesia de-
bet & bene uti, ut potest, vel idem hoc
mittere, & rite tollere, quatenus ipsi
ad edificationem & salutem omnium
facere videatur. *Zwingl. de Baptismo. fol. 96.*

Baptismus in Circumcisionis locum
succedere, abunde fides demonstratum
est. *Zwingl. ibid. fol. 95.*

Prohibere ne baptizantur infantes
accipiant, quid aliud est, quam eos-
dem à Christo repellere? *Ibid. fol. 96.*

Circumcision. And that to hinder children from receiving
Baptism is as much as to repel them from Christ.

Obj. *Zwinglius* is censured for saying, That Princes may be
deposed by the godly, if they be wicked, and go contrary to the rule of
Christ.

Answ.

I grant that *Zwinglius* hath words to this purpose. But
(as a learned Writer observes) *Zwinglius*
living in a Republick, did not suffici-
ently consider the Laws and rights of
Kingdomes. He thought that all King-
domes were elective, none successive and
hereditary, which was his error.
And hereupon, that they, to whom be-
longed the right of election, did re-
serve this power to themselves, that if
the King did not keepe his oath, but
did rule tyrannically; they might
depose him. *Zwinglius* also (in the
place cited by the *Marquess*) hath
these words, (which also the fore-
mentioned Author doth relate)

Non est quod eum trucidet, nec ut bellum & tumultum quis
excitet,

saying, That the matter was not of
such moment, as that there should be
so much stir about it, though there were
no testimonies at all to prove it. It is (he
saith) an external thing, and cere-
monial, which as other external things, the
Church may lawfully either use, or
omit, as she sees it make for edification
and salvation. Here *Zwinglius* seems only
to mean thus much, that the Church for
avoiding of tumults and combustions,
may for a while forbear the adminis-
tration of Pedobaptisme. Yet *Zwinglius*
was far from holding the baptizing of
children to be a thing indifferent: For
he saith, that it succeeded in the room of

I grant that *Zwinglius* hath words to this purpose. But
(as a learned Writer observes) *Zwinglius*
living in a Republick, did not suffici-
ently consider the Laws and rights of
Kingdomes. He thought that all King-
domes were elective, none successive and
hereditary, which was his error.
And hereupon, that they, to whom be-
longed the right of election, did re-
serve this power to themselves, that if
the King did not keepe his oath, but
did rule tyrannically; they might
depose him. *Zwinglius* also (in the
place cited by the *Marquess*) hath
these words, (which also the fore-
mentioned Author doth relate)

excer, sed alia viti res tentanda; quia in pace vocavit nos Deus, 1 Cor. 7. that is, Thou shalt not kill him, nor shalt any raise warre or tumult; but the murder must be attempted some other way; for God hath called us in peace, 1 Cor. 7. Concerning Zuinglius his opinion in this point, see likewise B. Bilson in his book entitled, The true difference between Christian subjection, and Christian rebellion, pag. 513, &c. But when the Romanists tax Zuinglius, and so other Protestant writers for such doctrine, what do they else but verifie that of the Poet, *Clamata ultra machos, Catalina Cethegum?* What do they else but tax others for that, wherein themselves are most faulty? See B. Bilson, p. 223, &c. & River, Jes. viii. cap. 12.

7. In the last place, Zuinglius is charged with this saying, That when we commit adultery, or murder, it is the work of God, being the mover, The author, or doer, &c. God moveth the thief to kill, &c. He is forced to sinne, &c.

That learned Protestant, viz. Gruperus, by whom (the Marquesse saith) Zuinglius is reprehended for this, was a Lutheran, and so is ready to reprehend any thing in Zuinglius as they of the Church of Rome are. But let Zuinglius speak for himself. The Law (saith he) being given unto man, he always sinneth; when he doth any thing against the Law; although he neither is, nor lives, nor works, but in God, from God, and by God. But that which God worketh by man is reckoned as a fault in man, but not in God. For man is under a law, but God is free, &c. Therefore one and the same act, to wit, adultery or murder, as it is of God the author, mover and inciter, so it is no crime: but as it is of man, so it is a crime and a wickednesse. For God is not bound by any law; but man is ever condemned by the Law. Here Zuinglius teacheth no other doctrine then (as I have shewed before) Aquinas doth, and no learned Romanist (I am sure) will gainsay; viz. that God is the author of that which is sinne in man; as adultery, or murder; yet not as it is sinne, viz. an irregularity and swerving

from

Cum lex homini est data, semper peccat, cum contra legem facit, quamvis nec sit, nec vivat, nec operetur nisi in Deo, ex Deo, & per Deum. Sed quod Deus operatur per hominem, homini vitio vertitur, non est in Deo: hic enim sub lege est, ille illius, &c. Unum igitur quod idem facimus, puta adulterium aut homicidium, quantum Dei autoris, motoris, ac impulsoris opus est, crimen non est; quantum autem hominis est, crimen ac delictum est. Ille enim lege non tenetur, hic autem lege etiam damnatur. Zuing. de Provida tom. 1. fol. 365.

Obj.

Ans.

*Permitto co-
actum esse, &c.
Zuing. ibid.
P. 366.*

from the Law, but only as it is an action, and hath some entity or being in it. Whereas he speaks of Gods forcing man to sinne, though I do not like the expression, yet it is but like to that which *Bellarmino* (whose words I cited before) useth, when he saith that God doth bend and wrest the wills of wicked men. The meaning of them both, I suppose, is, that God by his over-ruling providence doth so order it, that though (as was also cited before out of *Austin*) men do wickedly of themselves, yet he maketh them to do this rather then that, as he pleaseth.

*Of Melancthon's
Doctrine.*

Pag. 85.

Obj.

Ans.

The Marquesse now comes to *Melancthon*, and his doctrine. And 1. he chargeth him with teaching, that there are three Divinities, as there are three Persons.

Stancarus, whom the Marquesse cites as reprehending *Melancthon* for this, was *Melancthon's* adversary, and therefore his testimony in this case is of no weight. But the Marquesse also cites *Melancthon's* Common-Places, an. 1545. Now in *Melancthon's* Works set forth in four Volumes at *Wittenberge*,

*Lecorum Theologicorum postrema Editio
absoluta anno 1545.*

*Lecorum Theologicorum postrema Editio
absoluta Wittenberge anno 1543.*

an. 1580. in the *Index* of the Books contained in the first Volume, the last Edition of those Common-Places is said to have been in the year 1545. though afterwards where the Common-Places themselves are exhibited, the last Edition of them is said to have been an. 1543. But thus it seems the last Edition was at least an. 1545. if not before. Now it is not probable, that if such a grosse error had slipped from *Melancthon*, in his Common-Places, it would have been in the last Edition of them. However, I find no such thing in them, as is alleadged, but the quite contrary, viz. *Una est eterna Essentia divina*; that is, *There is one eternal divine Essence*. And again, *Sunt tres Personae Divinitatis*, that is, *There are three Persons of the Divinity*. So that *Melancthon* doth acknowledge but one Divinity, though three Divine Persons.

Obj.

Ans.

2. The Marquesse saith, That he affirms Polygamie not to be against *Jus divinum*, and adviseth *Hen. 8.* to it.

I find no such peece among *Melancthon's* Works, as *Concil. Theol.* which the Marquesse citeth to make good this accusation.

sation. But I finde *Examen Theologicum*, and in it the contrary to this, which *Melancthon* is here charged with. *Wee have seen many* (saith he) *who did neglect the usual Lawes of Marriages, because we read how of old they had many wives, and Jacob married two sisters. But we must judge not by examples, but by Laws; and in a matter of such moment as this, let Gods precepts be considered. It is most certain, that the first Law of Marriage was so established, that one man, and one woman should be joyned together. — The Son of God doth draw us back to the first institution, &c.*

3. He is said to teach peremptory resistance against Magistrates; and to inable the inferiour Magistrate to alter Religion against the contrary Edicts of the Superiour.

For the latter part of this charge the Marquesse citeth *Concil. Theol.* which book I finde not (as I said) amongst *Melancthon*s Works. For the former part, he citeth *Melancthon* on *Rom. 13.* but in that place there is not a syllable (that I can see) whereby it may appear, that *Melancthon* teacheth any resistance against the Magistrate. All that I finde is, that he teacheth Magistracie to be of God, and answereth the arguments of the *Anabaptists* against it.

Here the Marquesse addes, *So Calvin, so Beza, so Goodman, so Daneus, so Knox, &c. all hold it lawfull to depose, murder, or to arraign their Prince, &c.* But where these Authours, either all or any of them do hold thus, he sheweth not; he doth not so much as point at any of their writings where such doctrine may be found. I know that some of these Authours here mentioned, are charged in this kinde by *Romish* Writers; but withall I know that the charges brought against them are answered. See *Rivet. Jes. Vap. cap. 13. §. 9. 10, 11. Bils. of Christ. subject.* Page 509. &c. The former of these answers to what is alleadged against *Calvin*; the latter, to what is alleadged both against him, and against *Beza, Goodman, and Knox.* But some of the Authours, whom the Marquesse here citeth, as being of this opinion concerning Magistrates,

Vidimus etiam multos, qui usitatas leges connubiorum ideo negligebant, quod leguntur dissimilia veterum exempla de polygamiâ, & de conjugii Jacobi, qui duas sorores duxit. Non est autem exemplis, sed legibus judicandum, & in hac tantâ re considerentur præcepta divina. Certissimum est, legem conjugii primam ita sancitam esse, ut unius maris, & unius feminae conjunctio esset. — Filius Dei nos ad primam institutionem retrahit, &c. *Melancthon. tom. 1. fol. 339.*

Obj.

Answ.

To this pur-
pose doth the
Marquesse
himself cite
Mr. Barcroft,
page 103.

he was much mistaken in, viz. Barcroft, who did declare him-
self so much the other way, that he taxed some of these here
mentioned by the Marquesse, as being not respective enough
of the honour due to Magistrates. His book I have read,
though now I have it not; nor do I perfectly remember the
title of it. I think also that there is the like mistake con-
cerning *Sutchiffe*, whom the Marquesse also joyneth with the
rest; I think that he also was so farre from teaching such
doctrine, that he did rather taxe those, who did but seem
to teach it. But I am not so well assured of him, as of the
other.

Of *Andreas*
Musculus his
doctrine.

Page 86.

Ans^r.

After *Melancthon* the Marquesse speaketh of *Andreas Mus-*
culus, who (he saith) was not afraid openly to teach, that
the Divine nature of Christ died upon the Crosse with his
humane nature.

Wolfgangus Musculus is an Author well known; but *Andreas*
Musculus, I confesse, I have not heard of before, so farre am I
from being able to say what he holdeth: but if he hold, as
the Marquesse here alleadgeth, I shall be as ready to explode
and abhor his opinion, as any other.

Pag. 86. &c.
The divisions
of Protestants.

In the next place the Marquesse speaketh of the divisions
of Protestants, which (I confesse) have been, and are too
great; though divers of the Sects which he mentioneth, I
do not know that ever I read of before. But what if Pro-
testants differ among themselves, and so must needs some of
them be in error? Yet may they for all this be in the truth
so far forth as they all agree, and consequently so far forth
as they dissent from the Church of Rome. There were
many Sects among the Jews, as *Pharisees*, *Sadduces*, and *Herodians*,
spoken of in Scripture, and the *Essenes* mentioned by
Josephus. These differing one from another, must certainly
some of them erre; yet as they agreed together in opposing
Paganisme, they were all right.

Page 87.

Whilst the *Catholicks* (saith the Marquesse) have no jars, no
differences uncomposed, having one common Father, one Conductor
and Adviser, as *Sir Edw. Sande* confesseth.

Ans^r.

The Authours book, which the Marquesse citeth, I have,
but not so distinguished as that which he referreth unto,
and

and therefore I cannot finde the words which he alledgeth. But seeing mention is made of this book, I think it meet here to insert some things out of it, that so the Reader may perceive what manner of unity and agreement it is that is amongst them of the Church of Rome. But now (saith that worthy Authour) to come to the view of their Ecclesiastical government, not so much as it is referred to the conduct of soules, though that be the natural and proper end of that regiment, but rather as it is addressed to the upholding of the worldly power and glory of their order, to the advancing of their party, and overthrow of their opposites, which I suppose be the points they now chiefly respect; I think, I may truly say, there was never yet State framed by mans wit in this world more powerful and forcible to work those effects; never any either more wisely contrived, and plotted, or more constantly and diligently put in practice and execution: insomuch that but for the natural weaknesse, and want of, and dishonesty, which being rotten at the heart abate the force of what soever is founded thereon, their outward means were sufficient to subdue a whole world. In their art they have certain head-assertions, which as incontestable principles they urge all to receive and hold. As, That they are the Church of God, within which great facility, and without which no possibility of salvation. That divine Prerogative granted to them above all other Societies in the world, doth preserve them everlastingly from erring in matter of faith, and from falling from God: That the Pope Christs deputy, hath the keys of heaven in his custody, &c. These points no doubt or question is tolerable; and who so joins with them in these, shall finde great convenience in what other defect or difference soever, &c. And by this plot they have created in the world a Monarchy more potent then ever any that hath been before it, &c. And afterwarde, To what a miserable pass (saith he) have they driven the world, either in their pleading against them with such force of evidence, or in their learning of them, and joining with them, as to stop the mouth of the one, and hang the faith of the other on this unnatural paradox, I and my Church cannot possibly erre, and this must you take upon our own words to be true. For as for that coniectural evidence out of the Scripture, there seems to be as much, or more for the King of Spaine not erring, as there is for the Popes, it being said by the wisest, that the heart of the King is in the hands of God, a divine

Sir Edward
Sand's Europe
Spec. p. 23. &c.

Of the unity
that is in the
Church of
Rome.

Page 202.
& 203.

Page 204.
& 205.

Page 114.
&c.

sentence is in his lips, and his mouth shall not transgresse in judgement. And a little after: Although it were perhaps not untruly said by a great Clerk of their own, that the Popes not erring was but an opinion of policy, and not of Theologie; to give stay to the Laity, not stop to the Divines, of whom in such infinite controversies and jarrings (NB) about interpretations of Texts, and conclusions of Science, wherein many have spent a large part of their lives, never any yet went, neither at this day doth go to be resolved by the Pope, as knowing it to be true, which their own Law delivereth, that in holinesse any old woman, in knowledge many a Friar might out-go the Pope, but in power and authority the whole world was under him; yet at this day they do so generally cling to him, and draw by his line (as having no hope either of standing against their opposites, but onely by him, or of unity among themselves, but onely in him) that touch him, and touch them, &c. And elsewhere in the same book, It is a wonderful thing (saith he) to see what curious order and diligence they use to suffer nothing to be done, or spring up among themselves, which may any way give footing to the Religion which they so much hate. And first for the Scriptures, for as much as the Reformation seems grounded upon them, &c. though as well to beat back the irksome out-cries of their adversaries, as also to give some satisfaction to their own, that they might not think them so terribly afraid of the Bible, they were content to let it be translated by some of their favourers into the vulgar, as also some number of Copies to be saleable a while at the beginning; yet since having busied that former clamor, and made better provision for the establishing of their Kingdome, they have called all vulgar Bibles streightly in again (yea the very Psalms of David, which their famous Preacher B. Panigarola translated) as doubting else the unavoidableness of those former inconveniences. — Neither yet in their very Sermons, though they preach alwayes in a manner on the Gospel of the day, do they read, or any other wayes recite the Text, but discourse onely on such points of it as they think fittest, without more solemnity, that no sound of Scripture may possesse the people, although the use in France be otherwise for that matter. Yea some parts of Scripture, as S. Pauls Epistles, they are so jealous of, and think so dangerous, that by report of divers (for my self did not hear it) some of their Jesuits of late in Italy in solemn Sermon; and other their favourites elsewhere in private communication,

communication, commending between them S. Peter for a worthy Paul, and his spirit, have censured S. Paul for a hot-headed person, who was transported so with his pangs of zeal and eagerness beyond all compass in sundry his disputes, that there was no great reckoning to be made of his assertions; yea he was dangerous to read, as favouring of heresie in some places, and better he had not written of those matters at all. writings censured by the Jesuits, and others of the Church of Rome.

Agreeable to which I have heard other of their Catholicks deliver, that it hath been heretofore very seriously consulted among them, to have censured by some means, and reformed the writings of S. Paul; though for mine own part I must professe I can hardly believe this, as being an attempt too too abominable and blasphemous, and for these times too desperate a scandal. But howsoever, he of all others is least beholding to them, whom, of mine own knowledge and hearing, some of them teach in the Pulpit not to have been secure of his preaching, but by conference with St. Peter, and other of the Apostles; nor that he durst publish his Epistles till they had allowed them. --- And as in the foundation of the Reformation, which is the Scripture, so much more in the edifice it self, the doctrine and opinions, they beat away all sound and eccho of them, being not lawfull there to alleadg them, no not to glance at them, not to argue & dispute of them, no not to refuse them. In ordinary communication to talk of matter of Religion, is odious and suspicious; but to enter into any reasoning, though but for argument sake without other scandal, is prohibited and dangerous. Yea it was once my fortune to be half threatned for no other fault then for debating with a Jew, and upholding the truth of Christianity against him: so unlawfull are all disputes of Religion whatsoever. And their Friars even in France, in their endeavours to convert others, will say it is lawfull to perswade them, but not so to dispute with them. But in Italy this is much more exactly observed, &c. --- But the most strange thing, as to me it seemed of all other, is, that those principal Writers, who have employed themselves wholly in refuting from point to point the Protestants doctrine and arguments, are so rare in Italy, as by ordinary enquiry, I beleeve, not to be found. The controversies of Cardinal Bellarmine I sought for in Venice in all places. Neither that, nor Gregory of Valentia, nor any of such quality could I ever find in any Shop of Italy set eye on; but in instead of them an infinite number of meer invectives and declanations: which made me entertaine this suspicious conjecture, that it might be their care that no part of

Reasoning about matter of Religion not suffered in the Church of Rome, nor scarce to talk of it.

Bellarmino and such like Writers scarce to be found in Italy.

the Protestants positions and allegations should be known, they were so exact, as to make discurrent in some sort even those very books, which were constrained to recite them, that they might refuse them, &c. By these and other passages in that book, which the Marquesse was pleased to cite, we may see what a politique, indeed, yet withall a poor and pitiful Unity that is, which is amongst them of the Church of Rome, though the Marquesse here (as also before about the beginning of his Reply) doth so boast of it.

Page 87, Sec. But the Marquesse begins again to fall upon Protestant writers, and to inveigh against them, as guilty of strange and vile and of blasphemies, vilenesse and wickednesse. And as if the testimonies which he alleadgeth for proof hereof, were not to be doubted of, he saith, that they are the testimonies of Protestants themselves, and not of any of the Church of Rome. But the most of his testimonies are those of Luther and his followers, concerning *Zuinglius* and those that joined with him; or the testimonies of these concerning the other. Now these being adversaries one to the other, as the Romanists are to them both, the testimonies of the one against the other are to be accounted no more valid, then if the testimonies of the Romanists had been alleadged against them. Mr. Breweley premonisheth him, that shall undertake to answer his *Apologie*, to forbear to urge the testimonies of such, as perfidious professed enemies to the Roman Sea, and also of those, who though but for a time, did stand in some opposition against it. Yet himself (and from him the Marquesse) usually doth urge the testimonies of those, who were professed adversaries to them, against whom they are urged. But waving those particulars which are founded upon such testimonies (as indeed the most are) there are some other, to which I shall endeavour to give answer.

Of Luther's conference with the Devil. 1. It is objected, That Luther was taught by the Devil, that the Masse was naught; and overcome with the Devils reasons, he abolished it.

Luth. de Mass. privat. & unct. sacerdot. tom. 7. fol. 228, &c. Ans. It is true, Luther himself doth at large relate, how that about midnight when he awaked, the Devil did dispute with him, and convince him, that the Masse, which for many years

years he had celebrated, was evil and unlawful, as being most repugnant to Christs institution. This many of the Romish writers upbraid him with, as if the Mass must needs therefore be good, because the Devil did plead against it, & Protestants make use of those very arguments, which the Devil did urge in his dispute with Luther. But though the Devil be a liar, and hath alwayes some evil and false end at which he aims, yet the thing in self which he saith is not alwayes false. For he confessed Christ to be the Son of God, *Mat. 8.29.* and Paul and his companions to be the servants of the most high God, which did shew the way of salvation, *Act. 16.17.* Neither do I see any reason, why Luther might not come to see his error, and to correct it, by the Devils dispute with him, though the Devil intended no such matter; as well as Monica, *Austin's* mother, came to see her vice and to abandon it, by being upbraided with it by one, whose intent was nothing lesse then to work such an effect upon her. Mr. Breyerley will not admit, that the Devil in that dispute did seek to drive Luther to despaire: But Luther, whom any indifferent man will rather believe in this case, did judge otherwise of it. It is true (saith he) the Devil is a liar, but an artificial liar; his lies are more cunning and crafty, then man is able to imagine. He layes hold on some clear truth that cannot be denied, and doth urge it so subtilly, and doth so varnish his lie, as to deceive even those that are most wary. As that thought which he put into Judas, was true, I have betrayed innocent blood: this Judas could not deny. But this was a lie; Therefore I must despair of Gods mercy. Yet did the Devil bring him to this. Therefore when the Devil doth urge the greatnesse of sinne, he doth not lie: but herein be lieth, that he would make me to despair of Gods grace. I confessed (being convinced by the law of God) before the Devil, that I sinned; but with Peter I turne me unto Christ, &c.

Verum quidem est, quod mendax sit (sc. diabolus) sed ejus mendacia non sunt simpliciter artificis, sed longe callidiora & instructiora ad fallendum, quam humanus animus atsequi possit. Ipse sic adortur, ut apprehendat aliquam & solidam veritatem, quæ negari non potest, atque eam adeo callide & astute urget, ut acquirat, adeo speciose fucat suum mendacium, ut fallat vel caustissimos. Uti cogitatio illa, quæ Judæ cor percussit, vera erat, Tradidi sanguinem justum: hoc Judæ negare non poterat. Sed hoc erat mendacium, Ergo desperandum de gratia Dei. Et cum diabolus hoc mendacium, hanc cogitationem tam violentè urgit, ut Judas eam vincere non possit, sed desperaret. Proinde, bone frater, domine Papista, non meretur Satan, quando accular, aut urget magnitudinem peccati, &c. Sed

ibi mentitur Satan, quando ultra urget, ut desperem de gratia, &c. Confessus quidem sum (lege Dei convictus) coram diabolo, me peccasse, me damnatum esse, ut Judam. Sed verito me ad Christum cum Petro, &c. *Luth. loc. citat. fol. 230.*

Breerl. Apol. pag. 741.

that the Devill therefore did not instruct *Luther* against the Masse. But what if *Luther* were convinced of his error by those arguments, which the Devill urged against him, only to drive him to despaire? This doth but set forth the wisdom and goodness of God, in making use of the malice of the Devill for the good of those whom he loveth. As *Austine*

Quid tunc egisti Deus meus? Unde curasti? Unde sanasti? Nonne proutisti durum & acutum ex alterâ animâ convicium, tanquam medicinale ferrum, ex occultis provisionibus tuis, & uno istu putredinem illam præcidisti? Illa enim irata, exagitare appetivit minorem dominam, non sanare, &c. Atqui Domine rector cœlitum & terrenorum, ad usus tuos contorquens profunda torrentis, fluxum seculorum ordinans turbulentum, etiam de alterius animæ in sanâ sanasti alteram. *Aug. Confess. lib. 9. cap. 8.*

Pag. 88.

From *Luther* the Marquess passeth to *Zuinglius*, saying, that "*Gualterus* calls him the author of warre, the disturber of peace, proud and cruell: and instances in his strange attempts against the *Tigurines* his fellowes, whom he forced by want and famine to follow his Doctrine, and that he died in armour, and in the warre.

Ans. Zuinglius vindicated.

When I only looked upon the place, as cited by the Marquess, viz. In *Apolog. pro Zuing.* I could not but admire, that *Gualterus* in his Apologie for *Zuinglius* should write thus of him: But examining the truth of the Quotation, I am much more filled with admiration. For *Gualterus* is made to charge *Zuinglius* with these things, which he doth purposely and professedly clear him of,

com-

complaining of those that do charge him with them. He shews that *Zuinglius* was not the author of that war, which was betwixt the *Tigurines* and their neighbours. It was the fashion (he saith) among the *Tigurines*, when they went to war in behalf of their country, to have their Ministers along with them. And so *Zuinglius* went out to battel, and died in it, and that armed; yet not either as chief Commander, or Ensign-bearer, but only as a good Citizen, and faithful Pastor, who might not leave his people in such an exigence. And whereas the Marquess speaks of *Gualterus* his instancing in *Zuinglius* his strange attempts against the *Tigurines*, &c. it was a great oversight in him: For *Gualterus* only taxeth them, who say, *Zuinglius Tigurinis novi & exquisiti facinoris contra socios audendi author fuerit, ut videl. victus inopia & famis necessitate eos in suas partes concedere cogeret*, &c. that is, That *Zuinglius* caused the *Tigurines* to attempt a strange enterprise against their companions, (other Helvetians that were their confederates) so as by want and famine to force them to joyn with them, &c. Thus all this great charge brought against *Zuinglius*, is built merely upon mistakes.

The next that the Marquess falls upon, is *Beza*, upon Page 89. "whom is cast a most foul aspersion, That in his Epigrams he hath Verses concerning his Boy *Andebert*, and his Wench *Candida*; and that having debated at large which shane is "to be preferr'd, he chooseth the Boy at last.

Ans. If *Beza* had indeed sometime been guilty of this *Beza* vindictive enormity which is sained of him, what could any justly inferre from hence, but that the grace of God did eminently appeare in that change which afterwards was wrought in him? The Apostle having spoken of such as are guilty of grosse finnes, and among the rest of this here charged upon *Beza*, saith to the *Corinthians*, *And such were some of you,*

G g g

but

ingit, &c. Duo itaque hic nobis agenda veniunt; primum quod *Zuinglius* nec belli author fuerit, nec violente gladio immanis & barbari militis instar, in aciem & pugnam eruperit: alterum, quod non ideo vel miser, vel mendax, & blasphemus dici possit, quod eo mortis genere sublatus sit. — Licet his & communem patrie morem addere, quæ non abs re militis pro patria susceptis, verbi & rerum sacrarum ministros adhibere solet. — Pugæ non ut belli imperator, vel antesignanus, sed ut Pastor pro more gentis, & civis fidelis, *Zuinglius* interfuit. — Obiit certe in bello *Zuinglius* & armatus obit: sed bonus civis, & fidelis pastor suis periclitantibus deesse, nec gregem suum pereuntem deserere potuit *Gualt. Apol. pro Zuingl.*

but you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. 1 Cor. 6. 11.

But it can never be proved that Beza was guilty of such wickedness, though divers both Romanists and Lutherans

have charged him with it. Beza hath made answer for himself: 1. He confesseth that in his younger years he had exercised his Poetical faculty by composing amatorious Verses: but, he saith, it is no equal dealing, that what he did in sport, should be interpreted as done in earnest. 2. He professeth, that he had by a publike writing rejected and disavowed those Verses; and complaineth of his adversaries, who would not suffer them to be abolished. 3. He sheweth that this *Candida* spoken of in his Epigrams, is but a fained name. 4. That *Andebert*, who is also mentioned in those Epigrams, was a man of known integrity, and of great dignity in France; and that therefore an odious thing it was, so to pervert that great friendship and familiarity which he had with him, as to turn it into that execrable filthi-

Poenicos meos Iulus, quum ut res serio didas & scribas interpretaris, quis te iudex & quis audiat? Beza Apol. ad Claud. de Sanctis.

Cur publico scripto à me abdicatos facinus aboleri non sinis? Beza ibid.

Et quaream illa est Candida? Uxor mea scilicet: quum in meis versibus pregnantem superis commendando, quum uxor mea nunquam citam peccatit Beza ibid.

Quid, quum usque eò proveheris, ut meam cum honestissimo viro, & jam tum in Senatu Parisensi advocato, quem vocant, nunc verò in civitate Aureliensi magnâ cum dignitate versanti, amicitiam & familiaritatem summam ad nefarium & execrandum illud scelus transferas, &c. quis te ipsum vir honestus non execretur? Beza ibid.

Breerl. Apol. pag. 583, 585.

ness not to be named. Mr. Breerley, who sets down a great many of those Verses, which the Marquess doth but point at, takes upon him to reſell that which some others answer in the behalf of Beza, but never takes notice of this which Beza hath said in his own behalf.

Page 90.

But the Marquess returns to Luther; and besides other things which he objects against him, but proves only by the testimony of his adversaries, or by such pieces of Luthers own Works as I have not liberty to peruse, he taxeth him for giving such opprobrious termes to King Henry 8.

Of Luther's writing against K. Hen. 8.

Ans. It is true, K. Hen. 8. having written (or at least some other in his name) against Luther and his Doctrine, Luther did return answer so as to shew but small respect to the person

person against whom he wrote. But afterwards *Luther*, in an Epistle which he wrote to the King, confessed his fault, humbly craving pardon, and offering to write a public recantation, and to do the King honour, if he should require it. Indeed the King not answering *Luthers* expectation, but instead of accepting his submission setting forth another book against him, with his Epistle annexed to it, and insulting over him as if he had recanted his doctrine, *Luther* made answer to this book also, yet so as to abstain from those terms of contumely and reproach which before he had used, only shewing that he was firm and steadfast in his doctrine, yea daily more and more confirmed in it; and that no mans person, how great soever he were, should be of any esteem with him so as to bring him to any recantation in that respect.

principum arbitratu *Lutherum* sese ita submitturum ipsis, ut quasi partim recte pięque docuerit, petens sit veniam supplex: nemo omnium mortalium (quod ad doctrinam nostram attinet) unquam à me tanti fier, ut cum sim vel stolti pensurus, tantum abest ut quisquam me palinodiam cantaturum sperare debeat. — Absit nobis in causa religionis submissio: absit omnis patefactę veritatis revocatio. — Si quis forte libellum Regis contra me scriptum legens, dubitet de me meęque constantiā, & voluntate, quasi quę antea scripserim & docuerim, eā Epistolā, quam Regi scripsi privatim, recantaverim; is hoc sibi persuadeat, adeo me non recantasse, nec recomaturum unquam, ut aperte sententiam me indices incredibiliter magis magisque divinā grātiā corroborari, tam procul abest ut apicem vel iota sim revocaturus. *Luth. ad maledic. & contumel. Script. Reg. Angl. III. tom. 2.*

The Marquess having censured some of the prime Do- Page 93.
ctors of the Reformed Churches, falls to censure the people, as being generally averse from all honesty and godliness; and to this end he alleadgeth the words of *Luther*, and some others, who complain of the vicious and corrupt ways of those that live under the pure preaching of the Gospel; and he concludes, *How could the people be better, when their Ministers were so bad?*

Mihi conscius maximē sum gravissimē esse tuam Majest. libello meo, quę non ingenio meo, sed incitantibus his qui Majest. tuę partim favebant, insultu & pręceptis edidi. — Quare his literis prosterno me pedibus Majest. tuę quāvis possim humillimē, & per Christi amorem, crucem & gloriam oro & obsecro, Majest. tuā dignetur sese submittere, & veniam donare in quibuscunque Majest. tuam læsi, &c. Deinde si Majest. tuę sereniss. non videbitur contemnendam, ut alio libello publico palinodiam cantem, & nomen Majest. tuę rursus honorem, det mihi clementem aliquam significationem, tum in me mora non erit ulla, faciam illud libentissimē. *Luth. epist. ad Reg. Angl. tom. 2.*

Superbē ad istud Regis scriptum eram taciturus, nisi inę mea Epistola moveret, quom quicunque est libelli author, ita interpretatur, quasi palinodiam cecinerim, h. e. meam doctrinam retractaverim, ut omnino respondendum esse putem. — Si quis vel regum vel

Bellarmino urging also some of these testimonies, proceeds so farre in his censure, as to say, that though among them of the Church of Rome (for that he means by the *Catholike Church*) there be many bad, yet among Protestants (whom after his manner he terms *Hereticks*) there is none good;

Quod verò attinet ad populum, sunt quidem in Ecclesiâ Catholica plurimi mali, sed ex hæreticis nullus est bonus; & quanquam rex ipsa notissima est, &c. *bell. de Not. Eccles. l. 4. c. 13.*

*Of the people
professing the
Protestant Re-
ligion.*

and this (he saith) is notorious.

But if both Ministers and people were bad, as their adversaries pretend, yet might their doctrine and profession be good for all that. It was the Apostles complaint in his time, *All seek their own, not the things that are Jesus Christ's*, Phil. 2.21. Yet the doctrine of Jesus Christ; which they preached and professed, was never a whit the worse for all this, though with some it might be worse accounted of. In like manner the Prophets frequently complain of the people of the Jews, whose Religion nevertheless was the only true Religion in the world. See *Isa. 1.4, 5, 6. Jer. 5.1.2. & 9.2. &c. Ezek. 22.2. &c.* and so many other places. And that the Protestant doctrine is not to blame, what ever the Preachers and professors of it be, may appear by those very testimonies which the Marquesse and other alledge. For in that (as they shew) Ministers tax and reprove people for being so bad, it argues that the doctrine delivered unto them, is good, though they make no good use of it. But that Protestants are so universally bad, as that *Bellarmino*

Sed illud apud Genevates laudabile, si quid ulquam gentium, quodque Rempub. efficit, si non opibus, & imperii magnitudine, certe virtutibus ac pietate florentem; illa scilicet Pontificum censura, quæ nihil magis, ac diviniùs cogitari potuit ad coercendas hominum cupiditates, & ea vicia quæ legibus humanis ac judiciis emendari nullo modo possunt. — Igitur nulla meretricia, nulla ebrietas, nulla saltationes, nulli mendici, nulli otiosi in eâ civitate reperiuntur. Bodin. Method. histor. cap. 6. prope finem.

should say there is none good among them, is too grosse an aspersion; and wondrous impudence it is to adde, that this is notorious to all that know them. I will only cite the testimony of *Bodin* one that never withdrew himself (for any thing I finde) from communion with the Church of Rome: He speaking of Geneva, where *Calvin* and *Beza* were Ministers of the Gospel, exceedingly commends the discipline there used, *Then which (he saith) nothing could be imagined*

imagined greater, and more draine for the restraining of mens lusts, and those vices, which by humane Laws and Judgements could no way be reformed. Insomuch that no woredomes, no drunkenness, no dancings, no beggars, no idle persons are found in that City.

But to proceed, the Marquesse in the conclusion of all that he hath in this kinde, relates horrible things of *Calvin* in respect both of his life and death, alleadging that they are written by two knowne and approved Protestant Authors.

One of these Authors, whose words the Marquesse alleadgeth, was indeed a Protestant; but a great Lutheran, to wit, *Schlusberg*, and a professed adversary unto *Calvin*; and I presume so also was the other, who (the Marquesse saith) did write the life of *Calvin*, and confirme that which is said by the former, to wit, * *Herennius*, though I have not heard of him before. Mr. *Breerley* (so far as I finde) never mentions him, though he make very frequent use of *Schlusberg*, whose words concerning *Calvin*, here cited by the Marquesse, he alleadgeth in two several places of his *Apology*. But however, *Bolsecus* is the man from whom at first did proceed whatsoever any have in disgrace of *Calvin*, either for his life, or death. Now this Author lived some while at *Geneva* where *Calvin* was, and being opposed by him (it seems) for some things which he could not approve, he both became *Calvin*'s bitter enemy, and also turned back to Popery, and was a Papist at that very time when he wrote of *Calvin*, as is confessed by Mr. *Breerley*, who saith, that therefore he doth purposely forbear to urge his testimony; in which respect also, it may be, the Marquesse made no mention of this Author, because he would not seem in this case to alleadg any of their own Church. But to what purpose is it, that they forbear to cite *Bolsecus*, when as they cite those, who have nothing in this kinde but from *Bolsecus*? He was the first, and for some while the only man that did traduce *Calvin*, as concerning his life and death. And therefore *Bellarmin*, as writing before those, whom Mr. *Breerley* and the Marquesse mention, alleadgeth only *Bolsecus* as relating things

Page 95.

Ans.

Calvin vindicated.

* So the name is printed whether rightly or no I know not.

Breerl. Apol. p. 416. & 580.

Vide Beza in vita *Calvin*.

Breerl. Apol. p. 580.

Bell. de Not. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 14. & 17.

things that concerne *Calvin* of this nature.

*Breerl. in his
Advertisement*

But if Mr. *Breerley* (and so other Romanists) could think there was just cause to except against the testimonies of *Berns*, and others concerning Pope *Hildebrand*, called *Gregory 7.* allcading that they were his adversaries, and took part with the Emperour against him, though yet *Berns* was a Cardinal, and the rest were all Romanists; what candour and ingenuity is there to allcadge against *Calvin* the testimonies of those who did professe themselves adversaries unto him? Besides, that *Bolsecus* the first deviser of these calumnies, was one of their own party: For the things that are objected: That concerning the manner of *Calvins* death, appears most false by what *Beza* hath written of it, who being with *Calvin* at Geneva when he dyed, had more cause to know the truth then *Bolsecus*, who was removed (I think) from Geneva before that time.

*Beza in vita
Calvin.*

*Rivet. Jes.
Vap. cap. 2.*

And the other particular about *Calvin* being stigmatized, is clearly and fully refuted by *Andreas Rivetus* in his *Jesuita Vapulari*, where he produceth the very Records of that City, where this is said to have been done, and sheweth by the inquisition that was there made concerning *Calvin* (it being the place where he was born) that nothing is objected against him, but only his falling off from the Roman Religion. And thus (I hope) both *Calvin* and others are sufficiently vindicated, and purged from those aspersions that are cast upon them.

Page 93.

Now if I had a minde to recriminate, I might easily (to use the Marquesse his words) enlarge my Paper to a volume of instances in their Popes & Cardinals, Monks & Friars, Priests and Jesuites (not to speak of their other sort of people) of whose monstrous wickedness their own Authors have largely testified: But I like not *Camarinam hanc movere*, to stir this puddle; He onely cite one Distich of *Mantuan*, who was somewhat before *Luther*, and is commended by *Bellarmino* as a learned and godly Poet, and one that wrote much in commendation of the Saints; but see what he writes in commendation of *Rome*, where the Popes Holinessse (as they stile him) hath his Palace:

*Bel. de Eccles.
Scriptar.*

Vivere

Vivere qui sanctæ civitatis, discedite Romam:

Omnia cum liceant, non licet esse bonum.

Mantuan. Silv.
lib. 2.

That is,

Depart from Rome, if holy you would be:

For there may be all things but Pietie.

Towards the end of the Reply, the Marquesse goes about Page 96. &c. to prove, That the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is the same still that it was at the first.

But, 1. if all the testimonies were truly and pertinently alladged, yet are they not sufficient to evince what he asserts, not so much as one place of Scripture being produced for proof of any of those points, on which he insists. And therefore though those ancient Writers, which are cited, did indeed speak so much as is pretended, yet there being no ground nor warrant for those things from the Scripture, we may say in the words of our Saviour, *Mat. 19. 8. From the beginning it was not so.* 2. Most of the particulars which are mentioned, I have spoken to before, and have shewed, that neither Scripture nor Fathers are on their side, but both against them. 3. And for some few points not touched before, I shall briefly consider and examine what is objected.

"The Marquesse saith, That of old the Church did offer Page 98. prayers for the dead, both publique and private, to the end to procure for them ease and rest, &c."

Prayer for the dead, as they of the Church of Rome do *Ans.* now use it, is grounded upon Purgatory. It is certain (saith Bellarmine) that the suffrages of the Church do not profit either the blessed, or the damned, but only those that are in Purgatory. Now con-

cerning Purgatory I have spoken enough before, shewing that it hath no foundation in Scripture, and also that the ancient Writers do give sufficient testimony against it. That prayer for the dead therefore which the ancient Church did use, was not such as the Church of Rome now useth: It was not to deliver any out of Purgatory pains, which they were supposed

Certum est, Ecclesie suffragia non prodesse beatis, nec damnatis, sed solum illis qui in Purgatorio degunt. Bel. de Purgat. lib. 2. cap. 18. in initio.

supposed to be in, but to perfect and consummate their happiness. This may appear by *Ambrose* his praying for the Em-

peror *Theodosius* after he was dead. He beleeved him to enjoy perpetuall light, and tranquillity, and to have obtained the reward of those things which he had done in the body; yet he prayed for him; but how? That God would give him that perfect rest which he hath prepared for his Saints.

Da requiem perfectam servo tuo Theodosio, requiem illam quam præparasti sanctis tuis. Ibid. *In B. Ushers Answer* p. 200. it is cited, Da requiem perfectam servo tuo Theodosio. But in my book Edit. Basil. 1567. it is as I have attended, which redding doth seem much better then the other.

Dolendum est, quod nobis cito raptus sit; consolandum, quod ad meliora transferit. *Ambrosius de obitu Valentini*, Quod in terris seminasti, hic metes. — In Jacob Patriarchæ tranquillitate quiescas. Ibid.

Nulla inhonoratos vos, mea transibit oratio; nulla nox non donatos aliquam precum mearum contentione transcurret. Omnibus vos oblationibus frequentabo. Ibid.

Te queso summe Deus, ut charissimos juvenes maturam resurrectione succites & resuscites; & immaturum hunc vitæ istius cursum maturæ resurrectione compenses. Ibid. in fine.

Μὴ δὲ σὺ ἀδελφὸν τὸν προσηκουμένον ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκείνους ἀγαθούς, καὶ ἀσπῆς. *Lutwig. Basil. & Chrysost.* cited by B. Usher *Ans.* p. 216.

The Marquess cites *Tertullian* and *Austine*, but besides that *Tertullian* was fallen into the heresie of *Montanus*, when hee wrote that book, which is cited, as is

noted by *Pamelius*, and the book it selfe doth make manifest; besides this, I say, *Tertullian* speaks of a womans praying for her deceased husband, that he might have

only thus, That God would vouchsafe to raise them up with a speedy resurrection. And thus the Church (as it is in some ancient Liturgies) used to pray unto God, to remember all those that were departed in the hopes of the resurrection of life eternal.

Enimverò & pro animâ ejus orat, & refrigerium interim adpostulat ei, & in prima resurrectione consortium. *Tertul. de Monogam. cap. 10.*

have

have part in the first resurrection, which favours of the opinion of the *Chilists*, amongst whom he is reckoned by *Hierome* in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, where he speaks of *Papias* whom he notes as the first founder of that opinion. As for *Austine*, I have shewed before that he was not resolved concerning Purgatory, and therefore neither can any thing be concluded from about praying for the dead in that kind as they of the *Roman Church* do practise it.

"After prayer for the dead, the Marquisse speaks of the Page 99.
"fast of Lent, which he saith the Church anciently held
"for a custome, not free, but necessary, and of Apostolical
"tradition, and so to fast all the Fridayes in the year in
"memory of Christs death, except Christmas-day till on a
"Friday.

It is true, *Hierome* (as is all eadged) speaks of a Fast of forty
dayes, which they used to observe, and that according to *Hieron. ad*
the tradition of the Apostles. But this tradition was very *Marcel. Epist.*
uncertain, it seems, and the observation of the fast very va-
rious. For *Socrates* an ancient Ecclesiastical Historian records,
that somewhere they fasted three weeks before Easter, some-
where six weeks; and that in some places they began their
Fast seven weeks before Easter, but did fast only fifteen dayes,
not altogether, but now one day, now another. And yet
(which he saith he wondered at) all did call their Fast *Qua-*
dragesima. A forty dayes Fast. He says also moreover that
they did not only thus differ in the number of dayes, in
which they fasted, but also in the manner of their fasting.
For some (as he relates) did eat both fish and fowl: Some
did abstain from eggs, and all fowl that is inclosed in a
hard shell: Some did eat nothing but dry bread: Some
not so much as that neither. Some having fasted until the
ninth houre (three a clock in the afternoon) did then use
divers kinds of meats. And he saith, *At quoniam nemo de ea præceptum*
that seeing there is nothing in scripture *hæc autem mox omnis proclum potest*
commanded concerning this matter, it is ma- *ostender, pectum est, Apostolos*
nifest that the Apostles left free to every *liberam potestatem in eadem cujusque*
one to do therein as he should think meet. *menti & arbitrio permisisse, &c. Socrat.*
And the like also for the different

Sozomen lib. 7. cap. 19. mannner of observing the Lent-fast in respect of the time, hath *Sozomen* in his Ecclesiastical history, who lived in the

Rel. de scrip. Ecclis.

Page 99.

Ans.

same time with the other, viz. 440. years after Christ according to *Bellarmines* computation.

The Church (saith the *Marquesse*) held then mingling of water with wine in the sacrifice of the Eucharist, for a thing necessary, and of divine and Apostolical tradition.

Cyprian indeed in the place alleadged, viz. *Epist. 63.* doth speak of the mixture of wine and water in the Eucharist, as a thing necessary to be observed. But 1. *Austine* hath

Nos nullum Cypriano facimus injuriam, cum ejus qualibet literas à canonica divinarum Scripturarum auctoritate distinguimus. Aug. contra Crescon. lib. cap. 31.

Whence is this tradition? urumne de dominici & Evangelica auctoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis atque Epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse, quæ scripta sunt, Deus testatur, & proponit ad Jesum Nave, dicens, Non repedet liber legis, &c. Item Dominus Apostolos suos mittens, mandat baptizari gentes, & do eri, ut observent quæcumque ille præcepit. Si ergo aut in Evangelio præcipiunt, aut in Apostolorum Epistolis, aut *Actibus* continentur, &c. observentur divina hæc & sancta traditio. *Cyprian Epist. 74.*

taught us, That it is no wrong to *Cyprian* to make a difference betwixt his writings and the Scriptures. 2. *Cyprian* himselfe, though speaking of another occasion, doth shew us what we are here to answer, Whence (saith he) is this tradition? Did it come either from Christ in the Gospel, or from the Apostles in their writings? For God doth require us to do those things that are written, saying to Joshua, The book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth, &c. *Jos. 1. 8.* And when Christ sent his Apostles, he bade them baptize all Nations, and teach them to observe whatsoever he commanded, *Mat. 28. 19. 20.* If therefore it be commanded in the Gospel, or contained either in the Epistles, or in the Acts of the Apostles, then

let it be observed as a divine and holy tradition. Now in the Epistle, which the *Marquesse* alleadgeth, *Cyprian* proveth against the *Aquarians* (such as did use only water in the Eucharist) that Christ in the institution of the Sacrament used wine; this he proves by that which is written *Mat. 26. 29.* I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine, &c. but that Christ also did use water, he doth not prove, neither can it be proved by the Scripture. Yet our Divines do grant, that probably Christ might mixe wine and water in the Sacramental cup, not for any mystical signification, nor as a matter of necessary observation, but only as in those hot Coun-

tries

tries they used commonly to drink wine mixed with water ^{Pisk Clemens} to abate the strength of it. Neither do they therefore condemn them of the Church of Rome for using this mixture, ^{Esam.} but for using it so as to make it a sinne not to use it. *Bellar.* ^{Bel. de Euchar.} mine indeed saith, that it is no lesse certain that Christ did ^{lib. 4. cap. 10.} mixe water with wine when he instituted the Sacrament, ^{sess. Caterum.} then that he did use any wine at all for that purpose. For, he saith, neither the Evangelists, nor Paul make any mention of wine when they speak of the cup in the Eucharist. As for the words, *I will not drinke henceforth of the fruit of the Vine, &c.* he saith, S. Luke doth plainly shew, they were spoken not of the cup in the Eucharist, but that cup which was given after the eating of the Paschal Lamb. But this contradicts *Cyprian* in that very Epistle, which is alleadged against us. For their citing these words, he infers from them as a thing clear and evident, that it was wine which Christ called his blood; and that the Sacrament is not rightly celebrated, if wine be wanting. Yea *Maldonate* cites many of the ancient Writers besides *Cyprian*, who understand those words of the cup in the Eucharist. And whereas *Bellarmino* doth urge *Luke* 22. 17, 18. ^{Maldon. in} to prove that those words, *I will not henceforth drink &c.* ^{Mat. 26. 29.} have reference to another cup, and not that in the Eucharist, *Austine* (as himself confesseth) taketh those words in *Luke* to be related by anticipation, and not in their due order, which ^{Bellar. de} *Matthew* and *Mark* observed. And though he say, that ^{Euchar. lib. 12} *Austine* did not diligently consider the place, yet *Janſenius* writing professedly upon it, approves *Austine's* opinion rather than *Hieroms* who conceives two several cups to be spoken of in S. *Lukes* Gospel; neither doth *Bellarmino* answer his argument, which he doth alleadge for it. But however, he shews that the words, as they are related by S. *Matthew*, and S. *Marke*, cannot be referred to

Dico vobis, non bibem amodo, &c. Quia in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuisse, quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuisse, quod sanguinem suum dixit. Unde apparet, sanguinem Christi non offerri, si desit vinum calici, &c. *Cyprianus* lib. 63.

Mat. 26. 29. Bellar. de Euchar. lib. 12 cap. 11. sess. Si rursus.

Jam quæ de calice narratur à Lucâ, antequam acceptum panem commemoret, verisimile omnino est secundum Augustini sententiam, intelligenda esse de calice sacro, quo scilicet sanguinis sui participationem Dominus tradidit, ut per præoccupationem illa Lucas narraverit ante acceptum panem, &c. Jan. Concord. c. 191. sub inip. Verum verisimiliorem D. Augustini sententiam, illud facit, &c. Janſen. ibid. Quidam Catholicæ asserunt hæc verba (Mat. 26. 29.

non. 1. 42. 5) non esse dicta a Domino post calicem iterum, sed post primum illum calicem, cuius meminit Lucas, quem volunt alium esse ab isto, &c. At istud non patitur ordo horum Evangelistarum. Cum enim illius alterius officii federis mentionem periret, in facri, quando dicitur, ex hoc genimine, nullus alius calix intelligi potest ab eis demonstratus, quam cuius meminerunt. *Janfen. ib. sub finem cap.*

Sic autem in sanctificando, calice Domini offerri aqua sola non potest, quomodo nec vinum solum potest. Nam si vinum tantum *quo offerat* sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis, si vero aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo. Quando autem utrumque misceatur, est, tunc sacramentum sancte & coeleste perhibetur. Sic vero Calix Domini non est aqua sola, aut vinum solum. *De Cyp. Ep. 1. 63.* Falso Chemnitius Catholicis in commune tribuit, quod asserant aquam in Eucharistia esse de necessitate Sacramenti, cum paucissimi id affirmant. *Bel. de Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 30. sect. 1. Porro.*

Accusat Chemnitius Ecclesiam, quod existimet non posse esse calicem Domini, nisi aqua addit, & hanc vocat falsam opinionem necessario taxandam. At opinio illa, quod ait nec admodum loquendi. S. Cyprian. est lib. 2. epist. 3. Quod ad rem attinet, non est Ecclesie Catholicae, fortasse etiam nec S. Cyprian. *Belshid. cap. 1. sect. Quinto.*

Page 99.

But to proceed, The Marquesse saith that anciently the Church held exorcismes, exsufflations, and renuntiatiions, which are made in Baptisme, for sacred ceremonies, and of Apostolical tradition. And a little after, The Church in the ceremonies of Baptisme, used then oyle, salt, wax, light, exorcismes, the sign of the Crosse, the word Ephata, and other things that accompany it, &c.

But A. What authority is there from Gods word for all, or any of these Ceremonies? Let them be proved by the Scriptures

Scriptures, and then we will acknowledge them for divine and holy traditions; but otherwise we have no reason to do it. And for this we have Cyprian (to whom other ancient Writers might be added, if need were) to speak for us; as I have shewed a little before, though here among others he also be alleaded against us. 2. *Bellarmino speaking of rites*

and ceremonies saith, *That they must not so be multiplied, as with their multitude to overwhelm Religion, to which they ought to be subservient.* And for this he cites *Aufins*. But surely the ceremonies of Baptisme, which the Marquess here partly expresseth, and partly intimateth (Bellarmine doth reckon up particularly no fewer than two and twenty) are so many, as that they must needs overwhelm Baptisme.

3. Some rites and ceremonies anciently used in Baptisme, are now abolished in the Church of Rome. Anciently they used to dip the person baptized thrice in the water, which now Bellarmine saith is not so, but in some places they dip once, and in some place thrice; neither being of the essence of the Sacrament. But elsewhere he tells us, that the Church hath determined in the fourth Council of Toledo, that there shall be but one dipping used in Baptisme.

So also Bellarmine amongst the ceremonies of Baptisme anciently used, mentioneth the tasting of milk and honey or wine; which ceremony yet he saith now is not in use. Thus their Apostolical traditions, as they call them, they themselves can reject when they please.

The Church held then (saith the Marquess), Baptisme for lawfull of absolute necessity, and for this cause hath permitted lay men to baptize in danger of death.

The absolute necessity of Baptisme is not here simply urged, but only in respect of infants. The Marquess, it seems,

Ritus non sunt nimis multiplicandi, ita ut sint multitudo, obstant quodammodo religionem, cui servire debent. Ita docet Augustinus, Epist. 119. c. 49. Bell. de eff. Sacram. 1. c. 30. (lib. III. addunt.)

Bel. de Bapt. lib. 1. cap. 14. c. 26. c. 27.

Nunc pro regionum varietate vel una vel trina immersio adhibetur neutrum enim est de essentia Sacramenti. Bell. de Bapt. lib. 1. cap. 26. sect. Quarta. Ecclesia statuit, ut una tantum immersio daretur baptisimus, ut patet ex Concilio 4. Tolet. cap. 5. Bell. de Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 28. sect. Ac primum.

Quina: ceremonia olim fuit delibatilis et comestibilis, sed vixit, quia tamen hoc tempore non est in usu. Bell. de Bapt. lib. 1. cap. 14.

Page 99.

Ans.

Sed audio vos dolere, quod non acciperit sacramenta baptismatis. — Non habet ergo gratiam, quam desideravit? *Ambros. de obitu Valentini. Vide ibidem plura. Vide etiam Bernard. Epist. 77. & Aug. de bapt. contra Donatist. l. 4. c. 22.*

Baptismus fluminis, fluminis, & sanguinis. Bell. de bapt. lib. 1. cap. 6.

At sine dubio credendum est, veram conversionem supplere baptismum aque, cum non ex contemptu, sed ex necessitate sine baptismo aque aliqui decedunt. *Bellar. loc. citat.*

Si baptismus est necessarius, peribunt sine sua culpa infiniti infantes; quod strenuum videtur à Dei misericordia. Hoc argumentum Petri Martyris fuit etiam quorundam Catholicorum, ut Cajetani, Gabrielis, & aliorum, &c. *Bellar. de Baptis. lib. 1. cap. 4. sect. 5.*

Cassand. consil. artic. 9.

considered, that there are expresse testimonies of Antiquity for the salvation of some of years that die unbaptized. 2. And why is there not the same hope for infants? Why must Baptism be more absolutely necessary for them then for others? The Romanists themselves di-

stinguish of baptism, and tell us of the baptism of water, of the Spirit, and of blood or martyrdom; and hold either of the two last to be available unto salvation without the first. Is not God able to baptize Infants with his Spirit, though they want the baptism of water? And where hath

he said, that he will not do it? *It is without doubt (saith Bellarmine) that true conversion doth supply the want of the baptism of water, when any not through contempt, but through necessity die without it. Now it is without doubt, that God can, if he please, work spiritual regeneration in Infants that are not baptized with water; and that if they die without that baptism, it is on their part meerly of necessity, and not of contempt. And if children dying unbaptized, do necessarily perish for want of baptism, then Christian parents must sorrow for the death of such children, as they that have no hope; whereas the Apostle forbids Christians to sorrow for the dead in that manner, 1 Thess. 4. 13.*

Bellarmino also confesseth, that divers great & eminent writers of the Church of Rome, as *Cajetan, Gabriel*, and others have thought it not agreeable to the mercy of God, that innumerable infants should perish without any fault of theirs, meerly for want of that outward baptism, which it was not in their power to have. And *Cassander* testifieth that in his time many very learned men did hold, that though children died without baptism, yet the desire of the Church, and especially of their parents to procure them baptism, if it could have been, is accepted of

of God, and available to those children, as if they had been baptized. 3. The Ancients were as much for the necessity

of Infants receiving the Eucharist, as for the necessity of their being baptized.

Austine (as *Maldonate* relates) in many places makes the Eucharist so necessary, as to deny that Infants can be saved without it. For which opinion also the same *Jesuite* cites Pope *Innocentius*, and saith, that for 600. yeares it did prevail in the Church. Yet the Romanists have taken leave to depart from the Ancients in this,

therefore in reason they may give us leave to depart from them in the other, except the authority of Scripture can be proved to be against us. 4. Concerning the estate of Infants dying unbaptized, the Romanists themselves generally recede from the opinion of *Austine*, whom here the Marquesse doth alledge against us. For he saith, that there is no middle place for Infants; but that either they must inherit the kingdome of Heaven, or else must endure everlasting fire: and this latter he makes to belong unto all that die without baptism. But they of the

of another mind: For they make the damned to be in one region of Hell, where they are in torment; and Infants that die unbaptized; in another region of Hell, where they suffer no pain, but only the losse of Heaven, and that happiness which the Saints enjoy. They have no reason therefore to urge us with *Austine*, when as themselves do not accord with him.

The Church held then (saith the Marquesse) divers Degrees in the Ecclesiastical regiment, to wit, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Sub-deacons, the Acolyte, Exorcist, Reader, and Porter.

Augustinus *senectus* locis docet adeo esse omnibus Eucharistiam ad salutem necessariam, ut ne infantes quidem nisi ea sumpta salvi esse possint. *Mald. ad Job. 6. 28.*

Missam facio *Augustini* & *Innocentii* sententiam, quæ 600 circiter annos viguit in Ecclesiâ, Eucharistiam etiam infantibus esse necessariam. *Idem ibid. ad v. 33.*

The Ancients in this,

Venturus est Dominus, &c. dicit pariter facturus est, dextram & sinistram. Sinistram dicitur, ite in ignem æternum, &c. Dextris dicitur, Venite benedicti, &c. Nullus relictus est medius locus, ubi ponere queas infantes. — Qui non in dextrâ, proculdubio in sinistrâ. Ergo qui non in regno, proculdubio in ignem æternum. *Aug. de verb. ap. 8. serm. 14.*

Church of Rome are

Constituunt Scholastici communi consensu intra terram quatuor sinus, sive unum in quatuor partes divisum, unum pro damnatis, alterum pro purgandis, tertium pro infantibus sine baptismo abeuntibus; quartum pro justis, qui moriebantur ante Christi passionem. — Pro pena solius damni æterni est limbus puerorum. *Bellar. de Purgat. lib. 2. cap. 6.*

Page 99.

Here

Ans.

Here are eight several sorts of Ecclesiastical offices, which are reckoned as many several orders. For to presently after the Marquis adds, *And in the Episcopal order acknowledged divers seats of jurisdiction of positive right, &c.* Thus he makes Episcopacie, and to the rest, each of them a distinct order, and that (as it seems) of divine right.

But for Episcopacie, the School-men hold it to be no distinct order. *Lombard*, the Master of them, reckons but seven distinct orders, to wit, all these here mentioned, except Bishops, and says that anciently Bishops and Presbyters were the same.

Apud veteres idem Episcopi & Presbyteri fuerunt. *Lomb. ibid.*

Intra hunc gradum & ordinem contingit esse distinctionem dignitatum & officiorum, quæ tamen non sunt gradum vel ordinem non constituntur, ut Archipresbyter, Episcopus, Archiepiscopus, Patriarcha, Pontifex, summus. Hanc ergo opinionem sustinendo dicamus, quod Episcopatus præcise legendo non est ordo, &c. *Bonaventuræ Sent. lib. 4. dist. 24. art. 2. quest. 5.*

Patriarch, and a Pope. And he cites also *Hugo de S. Victore*, who was somewhat more ancient than *Lombard*, as being of this opinion. *Cassander* saith, that the

An Episcopatus inter ordines ponendus sit, inter Theologos & Canonistas non convenit. Convenit autem inter omnes, olim Apostolorum ætate, inter Episcopos & Presbyteros, distinctum nullum fuisse, sed postmodum ordinis servandi, & Schismatis evitandi causa, Episcopum Presbyteris ante præponimus, cui sollicitudo in ordinandis præestas servaretur. *Cassander consult. dicit. 14. monach. lib. 2. cap. 1. monach. lib. 2. cap. 1.* Apud veteres idem Episcopi & Presbyteri fuerunt. *Hieron. Epist. ad Ocean. Vide Hieron. Epist. ad Evag.*

Divines and Canonists do not agree in this, whether Episcopacie be to be reckoned amongst orders. But all (he saith) agree in this, that in the Apostles time there was no difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters; but that afterward for the keeping of order, and the avoiding of Schism, a Bishop was set over the Presbyters, and the power of ordaining was referred unto him only. *Hierome* is plain to this purpose, to wit, that at first Bishops and Presby-

ters were the same, and he proves it by *Phil. 1. 12. 28. Tit. 1. 5. 6. 7.*

For the last five orders, to wit, Subdeacons, Acolytes, Exorcists,

Exorcist, Reader, and Porter, they have no foundation at all in Scripture; we finde there no mention of them. And *Lombard* confesseth, that the office of Deacons and of Presbyters, are by way of excellency called holy orders; for that the primitive Church had onely those two, and the Apostle gave precept concerning them onely. So also *Cassander* saith, it is manifest, that Deacons and Presbyters are properly called holy orders; for that the primitive Church had those onely. And this he saith is testified by Pope *Urban*, and noted by *Chrysostome* and *Ambrose*. And as for the five lesser, and inferior orders, he saith, that now in the Church of *Rome* they are altogether confused, and almost abolished.

“The Marquesse saith, that anciently the Church had one Page 108.
 “Supereminent (by Divine Law) which was the Pope,
 “without whom nothing could be decided, appertaining
 “to the universal Church, and the want of whose pre-
 “sence, either by himself, or his Legats, or his confirma-
 “tion, made all Councils (pretended to be universal) un-
 “lawful.

1. The name of Pope anciently was common to all Bishops. *Hierome* calls *Alipius* an African Bishop, Pope *Alipius*. So also he styles *Austine* in divers Epistles, which he wrote unto him. 2. That the Bishop of *Rome*, to whom the name of Pope in after times came to be appropriated, is *Supereminent by divine Law*, was no part of the Ancients Creed. Indeed of old the Bishops of *Rome*, by reason of the wealth and glory of the City, did live in a very pompous and stately fashion, so as in their feasts to exceed

Cum omnes sint spirituales, & sacri, excellentes tamen Canones duos tantum sacros ordines appellari censent, Diaconatus scilicet & Presbyteratus, quia hos solos primitiva Ecclesia legitur habuisse, & de his solis preceptum Apostoli habemus. *Lomb. lib. 4. dist. 24.*
 Constat etiam sacros ordines proprie Diaconatus, & Presbyteratum, ut quos solos primitivam Ecclesiam in usu habuisse legatur, id quod testatur Urbanus Papa & annotavit Chrysostomus & Ambrosius in 1 Tim. ex eo quod Episcopi ordinationi statim Diaconi ordinationem subiciat. Ad minores vero ordines quod attinet, qui olim quinque se ordine consequentes memorari consueverunt; hi sancte presentis tempestate, neglecti omni disciplina, & politica Ecclesiastica prorsus confusi sunt, & eorum officia propenodum cessarunt, &c. *Cassander. Consult. artic. 14.*

Sanctum & venerabilem fratrem nostrum Papam Alipium, ut meo obsequio salutes obsecro. *Hieron ad Aug. Epist. 98.* Memento mei, sancte et venerabilis Papa. *Hier. Epist. 91. ad Aug.* Beatissime Papa. *Epist. 94. ad Aug.* Damaskus & Ursinus, supra humanum modum ad rapiendam Episcopalem sedem arduis, scilicet studiis asperissime conficabantur, ad usque mortis vulnenumque discrimina adjuventis periusque progressis. — Constatque in Basilica Sicimini, ubi rursus Christiani est

fully declares against it, and shews the absurdity of it. For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man understandeth him, v. 2. Now brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues (viz. unknown tongues) what shall I profit you? v. 6. And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? v. 7. For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battell? v. 8. So likewise you, except ye utter by the tongue words easie to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the aire, v. 9. Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a Barbarian, and he that speaketh, shall be a Barbarian unto me, v. 11. Else when thou shalt blesse in the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? v. 16. In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, then ten thousand words in an unknown tongue, v. 19. The case here is so clear, that

Ex hac Pauli doctrina habetur, quod melius ad ædificationem Ecclesiæ est orationes publicas, quæ audientio populo dicuntur, dici lingua communi Clericis & populo, quam dici Latine. *Cajetan in 1 Cor. 14.*

unde discere debemus eligibilis esse, ut in Ecclesiâ dicantur divina (horæ sacramonica, & missæ) intelligibiliter sine melodiâ Musica, quam sic ut non intelligi possint, qualiter sunt tam particulæ quæ sonis comminguntur, quam quæ cantus reddit imperceptibiles, &c. *Cajet. ibid.*

Illud etiam, quod jam auferre non possumus de ore cantantium populorum, super ipsum floriet sanctificatio mea, nihil profectò sententiæ detrahitis, auditor tamen periclor mallet hoc corrigi, ut non floriet, sed florebit diceretur. *Aug. de doct. Christi lib. 2. cap. 13.*

Cardinal Cajetan in his Commentary upon the place, is forced to confesse, That by this doctrine of the Apostle, it is better for the edification of the people, that publick prayers be made in a tongue, which both the Clergy and the people understand, then that they be in Latine. And hereupon also he expresth his dislike of the use of Organs, and of chanting in Divine Service, and saith, that it were better such musical melody were laid aside, and that Divine Service were so performed, as that people might understand it. *Austine* indeed shews, that in his time and Country the Latine tongue was used in Divine Service; but withall he shews, that the people did understand it, though they were not very Grammatical and exact in it.

And

And therefore sometimes barbarous words were permitted, because the people were acquainted with them, and understood them better then pure Latine words. For this reason he saith in that place, which the Marquesse citeth, that *floriet* was used for *forebit*, that is, shall flourish. And so elsewhere he saith, that he would rather use the word *ossum* for a bone, then *os*, chusing rather to be reproved by Grammarians then that the people should not understand him. And that the Latine tongue was then generally understood by the people where he lived, is most evident also by that which he writeth in his Confessions, to wit, that though he had very much ado to learn the Greek tongue, yet the Latine he learnt without difficulty, even whilst his Nurse and others played with him, and because he heard none speak any other Language.

The Marquesse, to prove still, that the Church of *Rome* is Page 100.
not changed, but is the same that it was of old, mentioneth divers things which the Church then (he saith) observed, as *distinction of Feasts, and ordinary dayes, &c.*

1. These are things of an inferiour alloy in comparison of many things wherein Protestants charge the Church of *Rome* to be altered from what of old it was. 2. The same things might be observed of old, yet not in the same manner as now in the Church of *Rome* they are, viz. so as to place the worship of God in such things. So they now do, which makes *Ferus* (though one of their own Authors) cry out, *Behold our stupidity and perverseness*. And again, *O preposterous Religion!* 3. If Protestants have abolished such things, besides that they might lawfully do it, God in his word not requiring them; and had just cause to do it, they being grown into such abuse; besides, I say, the Romanists cannot justly tax them for it,

Habeo in abscondito quoddam ossum. Sic enim potius loquamur. Melius est, ut reprehendant nos Grammatici, quam non intelligant populi. *Aug. in Psal. 138.*

Nam & Latina aliquando (infans utique) nulla noveram; & tamen advertendo didici sine ullo metu atque cruciatu, inter etiam in blandimenta nutricum, & joca arridentium, & laticias alludentium. Didici vero illa sine ulla penali onere urgentium, cum me urgeret cornu meum ad parienda concepta sua; & quia non esset nisi aliqua verba didicissem, non a doctis, sed a loquentibus, in quorum aures ego auribus parturiebam quicquid sentiebam. *Aug. Confess. lib. 1. cap. 14.*

Answ.
Vide stupiditatem nostram; & perversitatem. — O preposteram Religionem! *Ferus in Mat. 19.*

seeing they themselves have abolished some things, which formerly were observed in the Church, as I have noted before. And to those particulars before mentioned let this be added, that anciently Vigils were in use; both Priests and

*Polyd. Verg. de
Inveni. l. 6. c. 4.*

Nam quod dicis eum vigiliis execrari, facit & hoc contra vocabulum suum, quod dormire velit Vigilantius. *Hier. ad Riparium, epist. 53.*

*Polyd. Verg.
loc. cit.
Bell. de cult.
Sanct. l. 3. c. 17.*

And when *Vigilantius* spoke against it (though not without cause, as *Polydore Vergil* confesseth) *Hierome* inveighed against him for it, and scoffingly said, that in this he did contrary to his name, that he had more mind to sleep then to watch. But the abuse of these Vigils was such, that (as the said *Polydore Vergil* relateth) though the name continued, yet the thing it self was abolished; and so much also is acknowledged by *Bellarmino*.

Page 100.

"The Marquesse speaks of the Church antiently making Processions with the Reliques of Martyrs, kissing them, &c.

Ansp.

Austin in the place which the Marquesse citeth (*viz. de Civ. Dei, lib. 22. cap. 8.*) hath much about Miracles wrought at the monuments of some Martyrs: but of honouring or worshipping their Reliques, I do not see any thing that he

Dicit (Vigilantius) quid necesse est te tanto honore non solum honorare, sed etiam adorare illud nescio quid, quod in modico vasculo transferendo colis? Er rursus in eodem libro: Quid pulverem linreamine circumdatum, adorando o-scularis? Er in consequentibus: Prope ritum gentilium videmus sub pretextu religionis introductum in Ecclesiam, scilicet adhuc fulgentis moles cereorum accendi &c. Quis enim, o insanum caput, aliquando martyres adoravit? — Cereos autem non clarâ luce accendimus, sicut frustra calumniaris; sed ut noctis tenebras hoc solatio temperemus, &c. Hieron. contra Vigilant, cap. 2. & 3.

Nos autem non dico martyrum reliquias, sed ne solem quidem & lanam, non

saith. *Hierome*, indeed, in the place al-leadged speaketh of honouring the reliques of Saints, and doth contest with *Vigilantius* about it. But whereas *Vigilantius* did inveigh against the adoring of them, and burning Waxe-candles before them at noon-day, *Hierome* calls him a mad-brain, asking, *Who did ever adore Martyrs?* And saying, that they used Wax-lights, not as he did flander them, in the day-time, but only in the night, when there was need of them. And in his Epistle to *Riparius*, which was written about *Vigilantius*, he saith, that they were so far from worshipping the reliques of Martyrs, that they did neither

neither worship the sun, nor the moon, nor Angels or Archangels, nor Cherubim, nor Seraphim, nor any name that is named either in this world, or in that to come. He taxeth *Vigilantius* for grudging, that any respect was shewed to the reliques of Martyrs, and that they were not rather cast to the dunghill. If this were his opinion, I think few Protestants will plead for him. But howsoever, *Hierome* shewes himself far from that, which they of the Church of Rome do now maintain and practise. How exceeding grosse they are in this kind, *Erasmus* hath lively set forth, and that not in his Colloquies (which he wrote for delight, yet for profit also; and as the Poet sayes, *Ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?*) but in a more serious work, viz. his Annotations on the New Testament. You may now (saith he) every where see bett out for gain Maries milk, which they honour as much almost as Christs consecrated body; prodigious Oile; so many peeces of the Crosse, that if they were all gathered together, a great ship would scarce carry them: Here Francis his Hood set forth to view; there the innermost Garment of the Virgin Mary; in one place Anna's Comb; in another place Joseph's Stocking, in another place Thomas of Canterbury his Shoe, in another place Christs Foreskin, which though it be a thing uncertain, they worship more religiously then Christs whole person. Neither do they shew these things as things that may be born with, and to please the common people, but they place almost all religion in them, &c.

From Reliques we passe to Pictures. The Church then Page 100. (saith the Marquesse) had the picture of Christ, and of his Saints, both out of Churches, and in them; (not to adore them with god-like worship, but) by them to reverence the Souldiers and Champions of Christ.

angelos, non archangelos, non cherubim, non seraphim, & omne nomen quod nominatur & in presenti seculo & in futuro, colimus & adoramus, &c. *Hieron. ad Ripar. epist. 53.*

Dolet martyrum reliquias pretioso operiri velamine, & non vel pannis vel cilicio colligari, vel projici in sterquilinum. *Hieron. advers. Vigilant. cap. 2.*

Videas hodie passim ad quæstus offerri hac Mariæ, quod hunc prope odum æquant corpori Christi consecratum prodigiosum oleum; fragmenta crucis tam multa, ut si in æternum redigantur, vix una navis oneraria vehat: hic offertur Francisci cucullum, illuc intimam vestem Mariæ virginis, alibi pectus Annæ, alibi caligam Joseph, alibi calcem Thomæ Cannuariensis, alibi Christi præputium, quod æque res incerta, religiosius adorant quam totum Christum. Neque verò hæc ita proferunt tanquam toleranda, & plebisculæ donanda affectibus; verum hæc fere summa religionis vocatur, &c. *Erasin. Mat. 23. 5.*

Were

Answ.

Were there no
Pictures and Imag:s,

other point but only this concerning
it were enough to shew how much the
Church of Rome is degenerate. *Irenaeus*
taxeth the *Carpocratians* (who are also
called *Gnosticks*) for having Images,
some painted; some carved; and for
saying, That when Christ was upon
earth, his resemblance was made by
Pilate. And *Tertullian* not only shews
that Christians did not worship Images,
but he speaks more cold contemptibly of
them, calling them *cold Images*, & saying
that Kites, Mice, & Spiders, do perceive
what they are. And he observes, that
even the heathen Romans themselves
had no Images in the time of *Numa*
Pompilius, though he was the deviser of
that superstition, which was among
them. And it is very observable, that
Plutarch, a heathen Writer relates, that
Numa forbade the Romans to make any
Image, whereby to represent God; and
and that for 170. years the Romans
had no Images of a religious nature.
For (saith he) it is not lawful to represent
better things by worse, neither is it possible to
apprehend God otherwise then by the act of
the understanding. The Pagan *Cecilius*
upbraided Christians, because they had
no Images. *Minutius Felix* granted they
had none, saying, *What Image shall I de-
vise of God, seeing that, if you consider well,
man himself is Gods Image?* And when
the same Pagan objected, that Christians
talked of a God, whom they could
neither shew to others, nor see them-
selves; *Minutius* answered, That by this
they did beleve that there is a God, in
that

Etiā imagines, quasdam quidem de-
pictas, quasdam autem & de reliquā ma-
terā fabricatas habent, dicentes for-
mam Christi factam à *Pilato*, *grc. Iren.*
lib. 1. cap. 24.

Si statuas, & imagines frigidas mortuo-
rum suorum simillimas non adoramus,
quas milvi & mures, & araneæ intelli-
gunt, nonne laudem magis quā poe-
nam merebatur repudium agniti erro-
ris? *Tertul. Apolog. cap. 12.*

Etiā à *Numa* concepta est curiositas su-
perstitiosa, nondum tamen aut simula-
chris, aut templis res divina apud Ro-
manos constabat. *Ibid. cap. 25.*

Νῦμας δὲ θεοφόρον ἀνθρώπον ἦν
& ἱερουργοῦν ἐκείνην θεῶν Παύλοισι
ἐπιτίμην, ὡς ἂν πᾶσι ἀνθρώποις ἔτα-
χεν, ὡς πᾶσι ἀνθρώποις θεῶν ἀντι-
τίμην, ἀλλ' ἵνα δὲν ἱερουργήσῃ τοῖς
ἀνθρώποις, ἔταξε γὰρ μὴ ἱερουργεῖν
οὐκ ἐκείνην ἱερὰν ἱστορίαν ἀγα-
γεῖν, ὡς ἂν ἐκείνην ἱερὰν ἱστορίαν τοῖς
ἱεροῖς ἀποτίμῃ. ὡς ἐκείνην ἱστορίαν
ἀποτίμῃ ἀλλὰ, ὡς ἐκείνην. *Plut. in*
Numa.

Cur nullas aras habent, templa nulla,
nulla nota simulacra? *Cecil. de Christi-
anis apud Minut.*

Quod enim simulacrum Deo fingam,
eum si rectè existimes, sit Dei homo
ipse simulacrum? *Minut. in Octav.*
Deum illum suum, quem nec osten-
dere possunt nec videre, &c. *Cecil.*
Ibid.

At enim quem colimus Deum, nec
ostendimus, nec videmus; imò ex hoc
Deum credimus, quod cum sentire pos-
sumus, videre non possumus. *Minut.*
Ibid.

that though they could not see him, yet they were sensible of him. This argues, that Christians then had no Images, as Pagans had; for but by their Images, the Pagans themselves could neither shew, nor see the gods that they did worship.

Amobius also writing against the Gentiles, reproves them for their Images, saying that they shewed themselves not to believe that there were any such gods as they pretended to worship, seeing they must have some Images to looke on; as if their gods being not seen, were not at all. And whereas they did alleadge, that they did worship their gods by their Images, he asks them, if except there were such Images, their gods could not tell that they did worship them? That of *Epiphanius* is very famous; and most remarkable to our purpose, which he writes in an Epistle to *John Bishop of Jerusalem*, which Epistle *Hierome* translated out of Greek into Latine. He saith, that as he travelled, he happened to espy a Vail before a Church door, having in it the Image either as it were of Christ, or of some other Saint; for he could not remember whose Image it was. But when he saw such an Image, and knew that it was repugnant to the Scriptures, he tore it in peeces, and counsell'd the Church-wardens to make a winding-sheet of it, to wrap some poor man in when he was dead. *Marianus Victorius* (a Roman writer) saith, *It is wonderfull, how they that oppose Images, do exult from this place of Epiphanius.* And I say, it is wonderfull, how they that defend Images, are put to their shifts to elude this place of *Epiphanius*, it being so plain and home against them. This

K k k

An nunquid dicitis forte presentium vobis quandam his numinum exhiberi simulachris; & quid Deos videre non datum est, eos ita coli, & munia officiosa preestari? Hoc qui dicit, & asserit, Deos esse non credit; nec habere convincitur suis religionibus fidem, cui opus est videre quod tenet, ne mane forte sit, quod obiectum non videtur. Deos (inquit) per simulachra veneramur. Quid ergo, si hæc non sint, coli se illi nesciunt, nec imperari à vobis ullum sibi existimabunt honorem? *Amob. contra gent. lib. 6.*

Inveni velum pendens in foribus Ecclesie sanctum atque depictum, & habens imaginem quasi Christi, vel sancti cuiusdam: post enim satis memini cuius imago fuerit. Cum ergo hoc viderem in Ecclesia Christi contra auctoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere imaginem, scidi illud, & magis dedi consilium custodibus ejusdem loci, ut pauperem indotum eo obvolverent, & esserent. *Epiphanius ad Johannem Hierosolym. inter opera Hieron. tom. 2. Epist. 60.*

Scriptures, he tore it in peeces, and counsell'd the Church-wardens to make a winding-sheet of it, to wrap some poor man in when he was dead. *Marianus Victorius* (a Roman writer) saith, *It is wonderfull, how they that oppose Images, do exult from this place of Epiphanius.* And I say, it is wonderfull, how they that defend Images, are put to their shifts to elude this place of *Epiphanius*, it being so plain and home against them. This

Mirum est, quam ex hoc loco Iconomachi hodie exultent. Cum tamen ipsa verba plane demonstrent, non Christi, aut sancti alicujus, sed puri hominis eam fuisse imaginem. Imò si quis diligenter locum expendat, con-

Author

habet ex eodem contrarium maxime. Cum enim superius dicat, *Inveni ibi velum, &c.* dicere videtur, talem fuisse eam imaginem, qualis soleat esse vel Christi, vel alicujus Sancti, quæ in Ecclesiis depingi solita sit. *Mar. Victor. in Annotat. ad loc.*

What can be a more violent perverting of words then this is? *Bellarmino* therefore disliking this answer, as also that which some others give, saith, that the more common and true answer is, that those are none of *Epiphanius* his words, but are supposititious. But *Hierome*, it seems, took them for the words of *Epiphanius*; for else he

joyned them to the Epistle as a part of it.

The *Marquesse*, to prove the ancient use of Images, cites *Euseb. de vita Const.* but he cites neither book nor chapter, when as there are four books of that subject, and in some of them above 70. in some above 60. and where the fewest, above 50 chapters. It may be he meaneth that; which *Eusebius* relates *lib. 1. cap. 22, &c. viz.* That *Constantine* in a vision from heaven saw the signe of the Crosse, with this inscription, *In this overcome!* and being warned by Christ in his sleep to do it, he caused that Figure to be painted in his Banner which he used in his warres. But *Dr. Rainolds* hath long since shewed by the description which *Eusebius* makes *cap. 25.* that it was not properly the signe of Christs Crosse, though it had some resemblance with a Crosse, but was indeed the two first Letters of the name *Xpisti Christ*, joyned together thus *Xo* so that it was the name of Christ, that was thus represented unto *Constantine*. And if it had been the very signe of Christs Crosse; yet there being a special injunction for the making and using of it, (for I dare not discredit the relation) it would not follow, that therefore ordinarily the picture of Christs Crosse (much lesse of Christ crucified) is lawfull; no more then it follows, that the Jewes might lawfully have brought pictures and images into the Temple, because

because God commanded Cherubims to be pictur'd in it. *si eundem Deum obser- vas, habes legem ejus, Ne feceris similitudinem. Si & præceptum factæ postea similitudi- nis respicis, & tu imitare Moysen, Ne facias adversus legem simulacrum aliquid, nisi & tibi Deus jufferit.* Tertul. de Idolol. cap. 5.

The Marqueſſe also doth alleadge *Basil. in Martyr. Bar.* But, 1. *Bellarmino* (whom it is likely the Marqueſſe followed) *Bell. de imagin.* understands (or would have others to understand) *Basil* so, *Sancti. l. 2. c. 9.* as if he had seen the picture of Martyr *Barlaam* (of whom he was speaking) somewhere in the Church, whereas in *Basil* there appears no such matter. Only he calls upon the famous Painters, and bids them shew forth their art in drawing the pourtraicture of this Martyr. 2. I see not why by Painters there must be meant such as are properly so called; but that the word may be taken metaphorically for Orators, whom *Basil* would have to set forth the praises of the Martyr more lively then he had done. 3. However it were in *Basil's* time, yet the more ancient Writers, as *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Armbius*, and *Minutius*, (who are before cited) shew that in their time Images were not in use. And to those may be added *Clemens Alexandrinus* (who was almost 200 years before *Basil*) who proceeds so far as to make it unlawful for Christians to exercise the Art of Painting or Image-making; so far was the Church then from using any such Pictures or Images as we now treat of. And he tels the Heathens, that they were very studious to make an Image as fair and beautiful as might be, but had no care to keep themselves from being like to Images in stupidity. 4. A long time after *Basil*, when Images came to be used in Churches for history sake, yet they were not worshipped. *Gregory Bishop of Rome* (above 200

Ἀνάστη ῥῦ μοι ὁ χαμπεὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἐργαστῶν, τῶν τῶν σεβαστῶν καὶ βασιλικῶν ἐκείνων τοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ μετὰ αὐτοῦ τῶν κατὰ τὴν βασιλ. homil. in Martyr. Barl.

Καὶ γὰρ δὴ ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος ἡμῶν ἀναγράφει ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἐργαστῶν τῶν κατὰ τὴν βασιλ. homil. in Martyr. Barl. Clem. Alex. in Protrep. edis. Grec. in fol. pag. 24.

Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐστὶν ὁ νόμος τοῦ ἀνδρα- γοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀπορίας καὶ τῆς ἀνιδεῖας. Ibid. pag. 25.

Zelum vos, ne quid manu factum adorari possit, habuisse laudamus, sed frangeretis idcirco imagines non debuisse judicamus. Idcirco enim pictura in ecclesiis adhibetur, ut hi qui literas nesciunt,

saltem in par. tibus videndo legantur,
quæ legere in codicibus non valent.
Tua ergo paternitas de illis servare, &
ab eorum adorati. populum prohibere
debuit, &c. *Greg. lib. 7. Epist. 111.*

Et quidem quod eas adorari veniſſet,
omnino laudamus, fragile vero repre-
henſimus. Si quis imagines facere
voluerit, minime prohibe, adorare
vero imagines, modis omnibus deſira.
Greg. lib. 9. Epist. 9.

the making of Images,
shipping of them.

Non ſolum autem licere in Eccleſia
imagines habere, & illis honorem &
cultum adhibere oſtendit Parochus,
cum honos, qui eis exhibetur, refer-
tur ad protoypa, verum etiam maximo
fidelium bono ad hæc uſus, deum
factum declarabit. *Catech. Trident.
p. 43. edit. Colon. an. 1567.*

Sequitur quod eadem reverentia exhi-
beatur imagini Chriſti, & ipſi Chriſto.
Cum ergo Chriſtus aſſeratur adoratio-
ne latriæ, conſequens eſt, quod ejus
imago ſit adorati. latriæ adoranda.
Thom. part. 2. q. 84. art. 2.

that which it represents. The ſame reverence (ſaith Aquinas)
is to be exhibited to the image of Chriſt, as to Chriſt himſelf. And
therefore ſeeing Chriſt is worſhipped with divine worſhip, it fol-
lows, that his Image is to be worſhipped with divine worſhip. So Bo-
naventura ſaith, All reverence which is
ſhewed to the image of Chriſt, is ſhewed to
Chriſt himſelf: and therefore the image of
Chriſt ought to be worſhipped with divine
worſhip. And Bellarmine mentions di-
vers of their School-men beſides, as
Bell. de Imag. *Cajetanus, Marſalinus, Almain, Caſtyganus, Capreolus*, and o-
thers, that did hold this opinion. And though he himſelf
labour to qualifie the matter with diſtincti. ons, which
few

Omnia reverentia quæ imagini Chri-
ſti offeruntur, exhibetur Chriſto. Et
propterea imagini Chriſti latriæ cultus
latriæ exhiberi. Bonav. in Sent. lib. 3.
diſt. 9. art. 1. queſt. 2.

the making of Images,
shipping of them.

years after Baſil's time) hearing that Se-
renus Biſhop of Maſſilia had broken cer-
tain Images that were in Churches, be-
cauſe ſome did worſhip them, wrote
unto him about it, and commended him
for his zeal in not allowing Images to
be worſhipped, yet diſliked his breaking
of them, ſaying that ſuch as cannot
read, may be inſtructed by them. And
to the ſame purpoſe he wrote unto
him again, willing him not to hinder
him, but by all means to hinder the wor-

But what more common now in the
Church of Rome, then to worſhip
Images? Their Trent-catechiſme re-
quires the Pariſh-Prieſt to inſtruct
people, that the worſhipping of Images
is not only lawful, ſeeing that the ho-
nour done to them, redounds to thoſe
things that are represented by them,
but alſo very profitable. And the
prime Doctors of the Church of Rome
hold, that the very ſame worſhip be-
longs to the Image, which belongs to
that which it represents. The ſame reverence (ſaith Aquinas)
is to be exhibited to the image of Chriſt, as to Chriſt himſelf. And
therefore ſeeing Chriſt is worſhipped with divine worſhip, it fol-
lows, that his Image is to be worſhipped with divine worſhip. So Bo-
naventura ſaith, All reverence which is
ſhewed to the image of Chriſt, is ſhewed to
Chriſt himſelf: and therefore the image of
Chriſt ought to be worſhipped with divine
worſhip. And Bellarmine mentions di-
vers of their School-men beſides, as
Bell. de Imag. *Cajetanus, Marſalinus, Almain, Caſtyganus, Capreolus*, and o-
thers, that did hold this opinion. And though he himſelf
labour to qualifie the matter with diſtincti. ons, which
few

few understand, yet he grants; that improperly and by accident images may be worshipped with the same kinde of worship wherewith the sampler is worshipped. And thus Preachers (he saith) speak to the image of Christ crucified, and say, Thou hast redeemed us, thou hast reconciled us unto the Father. I will only here adde the words of Sir Edwin Sands, who speaking of the scandals of Christians which hinder the conversion of the Jews, saith thus; But the greatest scandal of all other is their transshipping of Images, for which both Jews and Turks call them Idolatrous Christians. — And therefore they say, for their coming to the Christian Sermons, that as long as they shall see the Preacher direct his speech and prayer to that little wooden Crucifixe, which stands on the Pulpit by him, to call it his Lord and Saviour, to kneel to it, to embrace it, and kisse it, to sleep upon it (as is the fashion of Italy) this is preaching sufficient for them, and persuades them more with the very sight of it to hate Christian Religion, then any reason that the world can alledge to love it.

Whereas the Marquesse speaks immediately after of the Page 100. sign of the Crosse, I grant, that anciently it was much used by Christians, as appears by Tertullian. But besides that he confesseth, that there is no Scripture for it, and other things which likewise they did observe; besides this, I say, he speaks nothing of adoring of the Crosse; and Minutius Felix, who lived about the same time with Tertullian, is expresse against it. When Celsus objected against Christians, that they worshipped the wood of a Crosse, Minutius answered saying, We neither worship, nor desire Crosse. The Authority that the Marquesse alledgeth to prove the ancient adoration of the Crosse, viz. Paulinus, I have not, and therefore

Admitti potest, imagines posse coli improprie vel per accidens eodem genere cultus, quo exemplar ipsum co-hetur. — Sic concionatores alloquuntur imaginem crucifixi, eique dicunt, Tu nos redemisti, tu nos Patri reconciliasti, &c. Bell. de Imagin. lib. 2. cap. 20.

Europ. Special.
page 228. &
230.

Admittit progressum, arque promoum, ad omnem aditum & exitum, ad vestitum & calceatum, ad lavacra mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quomodo nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus. Tertull. de Cor. mil. cap. 3.
Harum & aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarum si legem expostules Scripturam, nullam invenies. Ibid.
Et qui hominum summa supplicio pro facinorae puniunt, & crucis ligna feralia eorum ceremonias fabulantur, congruentius perditis sceleratisque tribuant altaria, ut id colant quod merentur. Celsus apud Minut.
Quos etiam nec colimus, nec optamus. Minut. in Octav.

cannot examine what he saith; but howsoever, he was above two hundred years after *Minutius*; and *Gregory*, who was about as much after *Paulinus*, was against the worshipping of any thing made with hands, as appears by the words before cited.

Page 101.

Finally (saith the *Marquesse*) *the Church then held, that to the Catholick Church only belongs the keeping of the Apostolical tradition, the authority of interpretation of Scripture, and the decision of controversies of faith: and that out of the succession of her communion of her doctrine, and her ministry, there neither was Church, nor salvation.*

Ans^r.

1. For Apostolical traditions, enough hath been said before. 2. And so also of interpretation of Scripture, and decision of controversies of faith. 3. I understand not what is meant by objecting against us, that out of the Catholick Church there is no Church. For the Catholick Church being the Church universal, and so comprehending all particular Churches as parts and members of it, who can doubt, that there is no Church out of the Church Catholick? But what is this to the Church of *Rome*, which once indeed was a sound part of the Catholick Church, but the Catholick Church it never was, nor could be, except a part could be the whole?

In that which follows, page 101. &c. there is nothing but the same matter as before, only the form is somewhat altered, and therefore there is no need that I should trouble either my self, or the Reader any further about it; only I shall adde one or two Animadversions. 1. Whereas it is objected (page 105. &c.) that *Luther*, after his deserting the communion of the Church of *Rome*, did yet hold some points of Popery; and so also *Husse*, and *Wickliffe*, and others, that otherwise opposed themselves against the errors and corruptions of that Church. I answer, That as *Rome* was not built at once, so neither was it demolished at once, but by degrees: it is no marvel therefore, if those worthy men did (at least for a while) retain some Romish opinions and practices, after that in many things they had discovered the truth, and stood up in defence of it. 2. Whereas it is pre-

pretended (page 106.) that before *Berengarius*, who was above 1000. years after Christ, none did oppose that reall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, which the Romanists maintain; besides that I have sufficiently confuted this before, the Marquesse might have seen from *Bellarmino* himself, that there were some, who above 200. years before *Berengarius*, did oppose that doctrine, which in this particular the Church of Rome now doth hold; namely *Bertram* a Presbyter, who was about 800. years after Christ, and (saith *Bellarmino*) was one of the first that did call in question that doctrine. But *Bellarmino* doth too much mince the matter; for *Bertram* did more then call in question that reall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, which the Romanists do hold; he did plainly assert that which Protestants maintain, viz. that the substance of bread and wine doth still remain after consecration, as is to be seen in *Hospinians* first part of the Sacramentary history, and so in others that cite that Author; for the book it self (I confesse) I have not seen, that I do remember. But that is here worthy to be observed; which the Romish censurers of Books say, speaking of this book of *Bertrams* about the Sacrament; *Although* (say they) *we do not much value this book, nor should greatly care if it were no where to be found, yet seeing it hath been often printed, and read of very many, &c. and we suffer very many errors in other ancient Catholicks; we extenuate them, we excuse them, and finding out some device, we often deny them, and sain some good sense of them, when they are opposed in disputations, or conflicts with the adversaries; we see not why Bertram may not deserve the same favour, and diligent recognition, lest Hereticks prate against us, and say, that we burn antiquity, and prohibit it, when it makes for them.*

Hic autor primus fuit, qui serio, & copiose scripsit de veritate corporis & sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia contra Bertramum Presbyterum, qui fuit ex primis qui eam in dubium revocarunt. Bell. de Paschasio Roberto in lib. de Scriptor. Eccles.

Quamquam librum istum magnum non existimemus momenti, itaque non magnopere laboraturi sumus, si vel nusquam sit, vel intercidat; attamen cum jam sæpe reculus sit, & lectus à plurimis, &c. in veteribus Catholicis aliis plurimos seramus errores, & extenuemus, excusemus, excoGITATO commento per sæpe negemus, & commodum iis sensum assignamus, dum opponuntur in disputationibus; aut in constitutionibus cum adversariis; non videmus cur non eandem æquitatem, & diligentem recognitionem mereatur Bertramus; ne hæretici ogganniant nos antiquitatem pro ipsis facientem exurere, & prohibere. Index Expurgat. an. 1599. pag. 12.

Some

Non male aut inconsiderate igitur omittantur omnia haec & po. 3. (Considerandum quoque; quod in pane illo &c.) usque ad illud multo post (Sed aliud est quod exterius geritur, &c.) — Legendum invisibiliter pro visibiliter. *Ibid.* p. 16.
 ☞ 17.

Writers, when they make against them, and then they pretend that all are for them. Thus the Marquess in the conclusion of his Reply (page 230.) pretends, that they have the prescription of 1600. years possession and continuance of their Churches Doctrine, and evidence out of the word of God, and the Fathers witnessing to that evidence, and the decrees of Councils, and Protestants own acknowledgements. But what ground there is for this pretence, let the Reader judge by comparing and considering what is said on both sides. And so I also shall leave the success of my labour unto God, in whose hand are the hearts of all.

Some things therefore in *Bertrams* book they will have to be quite left out, and some things to be quite altered, as namely for *visibly* to be read *invisibly*. Such devices have they of the Church of Rome to corrupt ancient

An Addition of some few things omitted in the
fore-going REJOINDER.

THe Marqueſſe, pag. 69. citeth Baſil orat. in 40 (it is misprinted 44) Mart. as affirming that we may pray unto the Saints departed. But in that Oration Baſil affirms no ſuch thing: He ſhews indeed his approbation of praying (not unto the Martyrs, but, which is quite another thing) to God at the monuments of the Martyrs. The moſt learned B. Uſher obſerves, That the memory of the Martyrs indeed was from the very beginning had in great reverence; and at their Memorials and Martyria, that is to ſay, at the places wherein their bodies were laid, (which were the Churches, wherunto the Chriſtians did in thoſe times uſually reſort) prayers were ordinarily offered up unto God, for whoſe cauſe they laid down their lives. But this is no argument, that they then prayed to the Martyrs, though that error might take occaſion (afterwards) to creep in by this meanes.

The Marqueſſe taxeth Calvin for holding, that Chriſt's ſoule was ſubject to ignorance. To what I have already ſaid in answer to this charge, I adde, that in this particular Fulgentius was of the ſame minde with Calvin. For confuting thoſe that held Chriſt to have no humane ſoul, he ſaith thus: If we muſt believe that the humane nature in Chriſt wanted a ſoul, what is it, that in Chriſt being an Infant, is ſaid not to have known good and evil? (Then he cites Iſa. 7. 16. expounding it of Chriſt, and addes) Therefore the humane ſoule, which is naturally made capable of reaſon, in Chriſt being an Infant, is ſaid not to have known good and evil; which according to the truth of the Goſpel, in Chriſt being a child, is related to have increaſed in wiſdome, &c.

Εὐλαβία γὰρ εὐσεβείας ὑπαρτικῶν
εὐχομένη καὶ λαμβάνουσα, ἀποδύ-
νεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπαποδοῦν ἀδικίαν,
ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῷ καὶ καλῶν μὲν μαρ-
τύρων γὰρ δὲ τῶν ἀδικῶν ὑμῶν.
Baſil. orat. in 40 Martyrs.

B. 7/b. Answer
of Prayers to
Saints, p. 434.

Si anima vel intellectus nature in
Christo defuisse crederetur humanæ,
quid in infante bonum malumque di-
citur ignorasse? (citat Iſa. 7. 16. atque
addit) Anima igitur humana, quæ ra-
tionis capax naturaliter facta est, bo-
num malumque in infante Christo ne-
cuisse dicitur, quæ secundum Evange-
licam veritatem in puero Jesu sapientia
& gratia profectisse narratur. Fulgent.
ad Trasim. lib. 1.

To that also that hath been said before concerning *Calvin's death*, let this be added: How far *Calvin* was from despairing at his death, as the *Marquesse* doth object, may appear by what he wrote to his dear friend *Farel*, when he

Agrè spiritum traho, & assidue expecto dum me anhelitus deficiat. Satis est quod Christo vivo, & morior, qui suis lucrum est in vitâ & morte. Calv. Epist. 344. looked for death every moment. I hardly breath. (saith he) and expect continually that breath should fail me. It is enough that I live and dye to Christ, who to those that are his is both in life and death advantage. This (as appears by the date

of the Epistle). *Calvin* wrote at *Geneva* the second day of *May*, in the year 1564. and (as *Bucholcerus* in his *Chronology* notes out of *Beza*) the twenty seventh day of the same moneth he dyed.

The *Marquesse*, page 99. speaks of Marriage as anciently held by the Church to be a true and proper Sacrament. This particular I omitted, having spoken of the rest which he there mentioneth, to wit, Confirmation, Orders, and Extreme Unction, in answer to that which elsewhere he saith of them. For Marriage therefore, 1. There is nothing in

Non habes ex hoc loco prudens Lector à Paulo conjugium esse Sacramentum. Cajetan. in Ephes. 5. 32.

the Scripture to prove it a Sacrament properly so called. That of the Apostle so much insisted on, *This is a great mystery*, *Ephes. 5. 32.* Their own Cardinal

Cajetane upon the place confesseth to make nothing to the purpose. 2. That the Fathers call Marriage a Sacrament, doth not evince that they thought it to be of the same nature with Baptisme and the Lords Supper. For (as I have before shewed) they often use the word *Sacrament* largely, and apply it to divers things, which even in our Adversaries account properly are no Sacraments. 3. *Durandus* an acute and learned School-man, who lived about

Argumenta prima probant, quod matrimonium non est sacramentum strictè & proprie dictum, sicut alia sacramenta novæ Legis; sed non probant quin sit sacre rei signum, & sic largo modo sacramentum. Durand. in Sent. lib. 4. dist.

26. quest. 3. num. 15.

the year 1320. doth hold, that though Marriage be a sign of a holy thing (to wit, the conjunction of Christ and the Church) and so in a large sense a Sacrament, yet it is no Sacrament strictly and properly so called, nor of the same

nature

nature with the other Sacraments of the New Testament, to wit, Baptisme, and the Lords Supper : and this he confirms by divers arguments. I know *Bellarmino* indeavours to answer *Durandus* his arguments; but his answers are confuted by *Amesius* and others, and therefore I will not stand about them. I will only prove from *Bellarmino* himself, that Marriage is properly no Sacrament. Every Sacrament properly so called, is administred by some other, and not by the same party, to whom it is administred. But Marriage is not administred by some other, but by parties themselves that are married, whiles they mutually expresse their consent one to the other : Therefore Marriage is no Sacrament properly so called. *Bellarmino* doth own both the Proposition and the Assumption, and therefore he may not deny the Conclusion. This is *argumentum ad hominem* (as they call it) of force against *Bellarmino* : I do not see what he could, or any holding his principles can answer to it. But to make the argument simply and absolutely convincing, I will frame it otherwise. For indeed the Proposition laid down by *Bellarmino* is not simply and absolutely true, to wit, *Every Sacrament properly so called is administred by some other, and not by the same party to whom it is administred.* This is not essential to a Sacrament; for then the Lords Supper should be no Sacrament to the Minister himselfe, but only to those that communicate with him. And so if *Abraham* did circumcise himselfe, (as is probable he did) his Circumcision should have been no Sacrament unto him, which is most absurd. Thus therefore I frame the argument : Every Sacrament of the New Testament is to be administred by such as are peculiarly appointed of God to be Ministers of his holy things. But Marriage is not administred by such : Therefore it is not a Sacrament of the New Testament. In the Proposition I say, *Every Sacrament of the New Testament*, because whether it were so in respect of

Commune est omnibus Sacramentis, ut ab alio dentur, ab alio accipiantur : neque ullus sibi ipse Sacramentum administret. *Bellar. de Missa lib. 1. c. 22. in initio.*

Matrimonium non eget alio Ministro præter ipsos contrahentes. *Bel. de Matr. l. 1. c. 5. sect. 1. Atque hinc. Et c. 6. sect. 2. ex his.*

Necesse est conjuges ipsos esse proprios hujus Sacramenti Ministros. *Et ibid. sect. 1. Neque absurdum.* Proprie qui Matrimonii Sacramentum efficiunt, ipsi conjuges sunt.

Circumcision, the story of *Zipporah*, and some other places of Scripture perhaps may make it questionable. But for the Sacraments of the New Testament, our Saviour hath ordained those that are Ministers of the word to have the administration of them also, *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* And the Apostle bids, *Let a man so account of us as of the Ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God, 1 Cor. 4. 1.* The Sacraments therefore being the mysteries of God, only the Ministers of Christ are now the stewards and dispensers of them. But

Quamquam requiritur ex decreto Ecclesie Minister Ecclesiasticus, qui consensus conjugum exquirat, & eundem approbet & declaret, & benedictione Sacramentali confirmet, tamen ipsi qui Matrimonii Sacramentum efficiunt ipsi conjuges sunt. Bell. de Matr. l. 3. c. 6. sect. Neque absurdum.

this is not necessarily requisite in the point of Marriage, that a Minister should dispence in. Though ordinarily a Minister be employed in the celebration of Marriage, for the instructing and exhorting of the parties married, and for praying unto God for his blessing upon them; yet this is not by Christ's peculiar appointment, but only (as our Adversaries confess) by the Churches order; and therefore not simply necessary; Marriage were every way complete, though no Minister were employed in it; though in divers respects that is expedient; but howsoever properly the parties themselves that are married, are they by whom Marriage is administered, whiles they give themselves each to other. *The End.*

Errata in the First Part.

Page 114. Properly, read piously. *p. 121.* deceived, *r.* deceased, *p. 122* saw, *r.* flew. *p. 123.* work, *r.* rock. *p. 124.* that, *r.* not, *p. 136.* supposition, *r.* suspicion. *p. 156.* *Patres, lege fratres, p. 205.* reply, *r.* rely. *p. 214.* thy, mine, *r.* my mine. *ibid.* die, *r.* did. *nomen, l. nomine, p. 215.* disceite, *l. dicite, p. 217.* So say the Translators, &c. That hath reference to those words, *Some may, and indeed do say, &c. ibid.* inevitable, *r.* inevitably. *be being, blot out being, p. 230.* If the Apostle had — *adde these words,* considered mankind as corrupt, he would not have said. *p. 231.* fastned, *r.* fashioned. *p. 235.* were affirmed, *r.* we affirm. *p. 252.* toy, do, *p. 262.* liking *r.* living. *p. 291.* Lombard who, blot out who.

Errata in the Second Part.

Page 26. this same, *r.* the same. *p. 40.* at least, *r.* at furthest. *p. 45.* contending, *r.* contending.

A. 1186.